

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

Price 23s. net. Yearly subscription 35s. net, post free. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 60s. net, post free

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series *Volume VII, Nos. 3, 4* *December 1957*

CONTENTS

P. Oxy. 2331 and others	D. L. PAGE 189
Three passages from Asconius	P. A. BRUNT 193
On coming of age in Athens	R. SEALEY 195
Plato, <i>Timaeus</i> 35 a 4-6	R. HACKFORTH 197
Thucydides ii. 4. 4	H. J. DIXON 198
The Lex Fufia of 59 B.C.	G. MACDONALD 198
A joke about conscription	A. F. GILES 198

REVIEWS:

The World of Odysseus (Finley), W. B. STANFORD, 199; *Pindaro, Olimpicas* (Fernandez-Galiano), D. S. ROBERTSON, 201; *Senofane* (Untersteiner), G. B. KERFERD, 203; *The Art of Greek Comedy* (Lever), D. MERVYN JONES, 204; *Form and Meaning in Drama* (Kitto), D. W. LUCAS, 207; *The Philosophy of Plato* (Lodge), J. R. TREVASKIS, 209; *Plato, Philebus and Epinomis* (Taylor), J. TATE, 211; *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien* (Gigon), G. B. KERFERD, 213; *Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stoikern und Epikureern* (Neubecker), E. K. BORTHWICK, 215; *Athéne i, ii* (Desrousseaux), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 217; *Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrusammlung* (Siegmund), E. G. TURNER, 219; *Cicronis De Natura Deorum liber i* (Pease), M. L. CLARKE, 220; *Persi Saturae* (Scivioletto); *Persio* (Marmorale), E. J. KENNEY, 223; *Persi Saturarum liber* (Clausen), E. J. KENNEY, 226; *Tacitus on Imperial Rome* (Grant), E. C. WOODCOCK, 228; *Apuleius' Metamorphosen* (Helm), R. BROWNING, 231; *Firmici Materni De errore profanarum religionum* (Pastorino), H. J. ROSE, 233; *Traité de phonétique grecque* (Lejeune), D. M. JONES, 234; *History of Education in Antiquity* (Maitou), M. L. CLARKE, 235; *Filologia minore* (del Grande), P. T. STEVENS, 238; *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Wagenvoort), H. J. ROSE, 239; *Die Bergwerksklaven von Laureion* (Lauffer), A. R. W. HARRISON, 241; *Sizilien und Athen* (Wentker), P. A. BRUNT, 243; *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique* (Martin), R. E. WYCHERLEY, 245; *Das Volkstribunat* (Bleicken), H. H. SCULLARD, 247; *The Aet Coinage of Galba* (Kraay), R. A. G. CARSON, 248; *Forms of Roman Legislation* (Daube), J. B. K. NICHOLAS, 250; *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche* (Petit), A. H. M. JONES, 252.

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME VII NO. 3-4
(VOLUME LXXI OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1957

P.OXY. 2331 AND OTHERS

I. P.Oxy. 2331: Anonymous.

P.Oxy. 2331 contains verses on the Labours of Heracles, and some sketches in colour. The latter, though rough, have some claim to attention, for only one illustrated literary text had hitherto been unearthed; the former, though humdrum, include some unattested and some very rare words.

My business is with the text only. A line has been omitted from the transcription of col. ii in the first edition: it contains a rare word, worth recording. Another peculiar feature was first noticed by Mr. Lobel when I consulted him. In two other places progress can be made in the reading of what is written; and in half a dozen more the text can be improved by interpretation or conjecture. The verses will remain mediocre, no better than a superior nursery-rhyme: but they may now appear more interesting in diction and more regular in metre than the first editor allowed.

Here is the text of cols. ii and iii as it stands in *Oxy.P.* xxii (1954), 88:

Col. ii

[.]χ[.]βεναρ. παντοτε γρυλλωι
[.]ε[.]αθλων ερισας ο περι καθαρμα
αλλ αυτος ερχεται καταδιαβενων
καρναρις αστομος δεινος αγροικος
5 [.....] μηδεν ολως τρεσας λαλησω
λεγεται Ζηνος Ολυμπιον φρασον μοι
ποιον πρωτον ο πεποιηκας αθλον {ειπον}
και μου μανθαν[[ε]] πρωτον επεποιηκα
(illustration)

Col. iii

Εις πρωτον Νεμαη λεοντα[
κρατεραις χερει μου τανταις απε[
(illustration)
Εις δις ληπον ε[γ]ω χαρα λεονταγ
προσπνιξας αλογως νευρον τεθ[η]κα
(illustration)

Col. ii. 1-2: I can do nothing with these lines, whether *περικαθαρμα* represents one word or two. The general sense may have been: 'I tell the labours of Heracles, adorned with a cartoon for each occasion.'

γρύλλωι: presumably 'caricature', with reference to the illustrations. This noun is quoted only from Pliny, *H.N.* xxxv. 114, by L.S.J. and *T.L.L.*: the context in Pliny shows that it was—and our poem shows that it long remained—a popular term for a *iocosa tabella*, an apt enough description of our illustrations. The verb γρυλλογραφέω occurs once, in Philodemus, *Rhet.* ii. 297 S.

4: These four adjectives are an odd lot.

(1) καρναρις: the first editor suggests a connexion with Latin *carnarius*, admitting that that is not used in any sense relevant here. The sense, and the termination -ις, are against *carnarius* but strongly in favour of *carnalis*, 'fleshly' (metaph.: the literal usage is very rare, *T.L.L.* s.v. 474. 67 ff.).

(2) ἄστομος: the context is against 'speechless' or 'hard-mouthed'. I suspect a mistranslation from Latin into Greek, but cannot think of the right word, unless the writer meant ἄστομος, *effrenus*.

(3) ἄγροικος: the writer had in mind Latin *agrestis*, which he ought to have rendered by ἄγριος, not ἄγροικος: *agrestis*, unlike ἄγροικος, may mean 'brutal', 'savage'; *saevus* and *agrestis* make a good pair in Latin, like δεινός and ἄγριος (but not ἄγροικος), cf. Cicero, *de Senect.* 47 *agresti ac furioso*, translating Plato's λυττωντά τινα καὶ ἄγριον; *pro Archia* 17 *animo agresti ac duro*; *T.L.L.* s.v. 1419.

Between 4 and 5 there is another line in the papyrus: δ. προσεμαγοε. ἢ στριεληνος. ὁ τριεληνος, of Heracles, is an exquisite and very rare epithet, hitherto not attested until Palladas, *Anth. Pal.* ix. 441; Nonnus, *Dion.* vii. 126; Anon. *Anth. Plan.* iv. 102. τριεπερος is as early as Lycophron, *Alex.* 33 with Schol.; cf. Diod. Sic. iv. 9. 2; Apollod. ii. 4. 8 with Epit. Vat.; Alciphron iii. 38; Schol. *ABT Iliad* xiv. 323-4.

I have consulted Mr. Lobel about the reading of what precedes ὁ τριεληνος, but cannot make sense of it: πρὸς ἔμ' would do well, leading to the first person λαλήσω in the next line; but αγοε. ἢ is intractable. It may be worth while to warn against a false trail: I tried ΑΝΤΡΟΘΕ for Δ. ΠΡΟΘΕ, but Mr. Lobel assures me that this cannot be read.

6: Π has λεγεται, not λεγεται.

7: The construction seems to be a combination of ποῖον πεποίηκας and ὁ πεποίηκας. The metre would be mended by supplementing ὁ <τι>, a likely likely enough omission before πεποίηκας. αθλον seems to me a likelier interpolation than ειπον: after λεγε and φρασον there can have been no temptation to interpolate ειπον.

8: ἐπεποιήκη conj. ed. pr.; or perhaps rather μάνθανε πρῶτον ὁ πεποίηκα.

Col. iii. 1: The first word in iii. 3 is certainly εγο (Lobel), not εις, and so presumably here (where Π is less clearly legible). I do not know where else this Latin form is to be found in a Greek dress.

λεοντα[ν] presumable here, if that is the form in iii. 3.

2: Metre requires χε(ι)ρεσι, so we are rid of the unwelcome form χερεσι.

3: διςληπον should presumably be δυσληπ(τ)ον. ε[γ]ω is now ruled out by εγο at the beginning of the line; it must have been ε[χ]ω. χαρα cannot be right: the lion suggests χάρων or χάροψ; simplest χάρ(ο)ψα.

λεονταν = λέοντα (not, as I first thought, λεοντάν, 'lion's skin').

4: ἀλόγως makes no sense: the writer intended ἀμόγως, completing only half the μ. Hesych. ἀμόγωι· ἀκοπιάστωι; the adverb is not found elsewhere.

νευρον: Π has νεκρον (Lobel). τεθ[] might well have provided us with an example of pcpl. θήκας, νεκρόν τε θήκας.

The metre is fundamentally ionic, — — — — — — — — — —. When a long replaces

the first two short syllables, the line is indistinguishable from the hendecasyllable ---o---o---o---, glyconic + bacchiac. In col. iii. 2 the anacreontic takes the form o---o---o---o--- (-εσι μου ταῦταις ἀπε[-]); a rarity, but as old as Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 1021 = 1029, *P.V.* 405 = 414. Col. ii. 4 (cf. ii. 1) offers o---o---o---o---, = anacreontic + ionic, o---o---o---o---. Col. ii. 3 offers o---o---o---o---, apparently iambic trimeter catalectic, but essentially indistinguishable from ii. 4, o---o---o---o---. Ed. pr. aptly quotes the sixth hymn of Synesius (Wilamowitz, *G.V.*, p. 144): another good parallel, more or less contemporary, is the *Record of a Cure by Sarapis*, my *Gk. Lit. Papyri* no. 96.

I should read and interpret as follows, from col. ii. 3 onwards, including a few supplements appropriate to their contexts:

Col. ii

- ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἔρχεται καταδιαβαίνων
 4 κάρναλις ἄστομος δεινὸς ἀγροικος
 4^aδ. προσεμαγοε.ω ὁ τρικέληνος
 5 μὴδὲν ὅλως τρέας λαλήσας
 λέγε παῖ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου, φράσον μοι
 ποῖον πρῶτον ὁ <τι> πεποιήκας εἶπον.
 καὶ μου μάνθαν' ὁ πρῶτον ἐπεποιήκη.
 [*Drawing of Heracles facing (right) a*
rocky or mountainous landscape]

Col. iii

- ἐγὼ πρῶτον Νεμέη λέοντα [μάριψας (or -τα[ν ἀγξας?)]
 κρατερὰς χε<ι>ρεῖς μου ταῦταις ἀπέ[κταν.
 [*Drawing of Heracles strangling the lion*]
 ἐγὼ δύσληπ<τ>ον εἴ[χ]ω χάρ<οπ>α λέονταν
 προσπνίξας ἀμόγως νεκρὸν τέθ[εικα.
 [*Similar drawing, but the lion looks much*
less comfortable; I suppose it is dead.]

Addenda lexicis: καταδιαβαίνων, προσπνίξας, κάρναλις, ἐγὼ, ἀμόγως s.v.l.; first appearance of τρικέληνος, and in Greek of γρύλλος; the usages of ἄστομος and ἀγροικος here might be helpful in another context.

II. P.Oxy. 2162 fr. 1(a), col. i. 15: Aeschylus.

- ἰδοῦσα γὰρ νιν σαφῶς
 τρέπουτ' ἂν †ἀξιάζουτό θ' ὥς
 δοκοῦς' ἔμ' εἶναι τὸν ἐξ-
 ἔθρεψεν οὕτως ἐμφέρης ὁδ' ἐστίν.

I have seen several conjectures for ἀξιάζουτο, but not the one which seems to me to give the best sense with the least change: the ξ was written in error, and the true reading was αἰάζουτο; my mother would think that what she saw was *my head*, and very naturally she would turn away and utter a cry of anguish. Verbs of lamentation are commonly used in the middle voice (στενόμεναι, κλαίόμεναι al.): αἰάζουτο is not more remarkable than, for example, πομπύζεται *Soph.* fr. 878 P., ἀλαλαζομένη fr. 534. 6 P.

III. P.Oxy. 2256 fr. 9(a) 16: Aeschylus.

ποιὰς δὲ τ[μ]ῆς ἀρχ..... εἰα[

Lobel's apparatus informs us as follows: At the end, α[may be λ[. After ἀρχ, there are the remains of an upright (ι is strongly suggested by the facsimile, and since α, ε, ο, υ are impossible and a short syllable is required, ι it must have been.) Before εἰα, the reading suggested is τρν. Between ἀρχι and τρνεις there were three letters, of which the middle one may have been ε. In sum, it looks as though the manuscript offers ἀρχι.ε.τρνεις: if so, that can be nothing but ἀρχιτεκτονεῖς,

ποιὰς δὲ τμῆς ἀρχιτεκτονεῖς, λέγε.

The trace of a letter before τρνεις suits κ; before the first ε, there is a trace (uncomfortably close to the ε) which was not part of the alleged τ.

For ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν, cf. Ar. *Peace* 305, πρὸς τὰδ' ἡμῖν εἴ τι χρὴ δρᾶν φράζε κἀρχιτεκτόνει, 'be our foreman'; also fr. 195 (Pollux vii. 117). 'Of what privilege are you the originator?', or possibly 'Of what office are you the chief executive?'

IV. P.Oxy. 2359: Stesichorus, *ὑποθήραι*.

Fr. 1, col. i	Θεσ]τιάδαι
]αρ ὀψιγόνου τε καὶ ἀσπασί-
οι]ν ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀτὰρ πόδας
]τ...αθο. Προκάων Κλυτί-
5 ος]εθαν

πόδας strongly suggests ὠκέες; πόδας | ὠκέες αἰχματαί]τ' ἀγαθοί gives a line of very reasonable length, followed perhaps by Κλυτί-|ος τ' ἐς ἀγῶνα νεε]εθαν. | τῷ μὲν ἴταν, Φθί]ας δὲ μολ' Εὐρυτίων. Three lines below occurs *Εἰλατίδαο δαΐφρονος*: the Elatid must surely be Kaineus, and the genitive of the patronymic (which requires some special explanation; see Lobel's note) may have been in agreement with *Καινέος βία*. At the beginning the sense was presumably something like Θεστιάδαι: | οὐ πάντες, ὅσοι γὰρ ὀψιγόνου τε καὶ ἀσπασί|οι γενέταις, μένον ἐν μεγάροισιν. ἀτὰρ πόδας | κτλ.

V. P.Hibeh II no. 173: Archilochus.

Ὁμήρου
[μή τι σύ γ'] ἀθανάτοισι θεο[ίς] ἀντικρὺ μάχεσθαι.
Ἀρχιλόχου
κούδεῖς δ' ἔπειτα σὺν θεοῖς]

For the end of the line, ed. pr. suggested *μαχήσεται*, admitting that *μάχομαι* σὺν ought not to mean 'fight against'. There is another objection: the dative plural inside the line was surely -οῖσι not -οῖς. With *θεοῖσι*, the range of possibilities is quite narrow, and one supplement in particular seems irresistible,

σὺν θεοῖς] αἶψαι μάχην.

THREE PASSAGES FROM ASCONIUS

THE link between the passages discussed below is that all bear on the so-called first Catilinarian conspiracy. H. Frisch (*Classica et Mediaevalia*, ix) argued that there was no such conspiracy: I agree and think the case might be strengthened, but my concern here is primarily with the interpretation of the texts. I cite the text of Clark's edition.

(a) Asconius (p. 83. 14 ff.) quotes a passage from *In toga candida* to the effect that Catiline and Antonius along with their *sequestres* had met the previous night at the house 'cuiusdam hominis nobilis et valde in hoc largitionis quaestu noti et cogniti'. Asconius comments that he means the house of Caesar or Crassus, the chief opponents of Cicero's election: 'et hoc ipse Cicero in expositione consiliorum suorum significat'. Long ago E. Schwartz (*Hermes*, xxxii. 557-9 = *Ges. Schr.* ii. 278-80) identified this *expositio* with the secret memoir which was only published after Cicero's own death (Dio xxxix. 10).¹ Probably it was that work of more than Theopompan bitterness, described by Cicero in 59 as ἀνέκδοτα (*Att.* ii. 6. 2), which he was apparently still polishing in 44 (xiv. 17. 6); he then alleges that it is more perilous to attack 'that wicked faction' after the death of the tyrant (Caesar) than in his life. The allegation is not very plausible, but the passage shows the bitterness against Caesar that evidently characterized the work and that had probably been aggravated in the course of time.

Asconius goes on: 'eius quoque coniurationis quae Cotta et Torquato coss. ante annum quam haec dicerentur facta est a Catilina et Pisone arguit M. Crassum auctorem fuisse.' I take it that this too is a citation from the secret memoir. *Quoque* makes this linguistically natural; nor is there any indication that Cicero had referred at this point of his speech to the alleged plot of 66-65. Asconius is giving us for good measure another piece of information from the *expositio*. Plut. *Crass.* 13. 3 says that in a posthumous λόγος Cicero plainly inculpated Crassus and Caesar in the plot of 63. This too (as Schwartz held) refers to the secret memoir. While Crassus or Caesar was alive, Cicero never dared bring such charges. In this speech *In toga candida* he could, at most, have hinted only darkly at their complicity in a plan 'to massacre the senate'. But *arguit* is not appropriate for a covert allusion. Moreover Asconius would surely have quoted the actual allusion before explaining it. Hence the last sentence in his note must refer, like the preceding one, to the posthumous history; this is admitted even by some (e.g. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie*², p. 20 n. 3) who still believe in Crassus' and Caesar's complicity. The contrary view of this text, taken for instance by T. Rice Holmes, *Roman Republic*, i. 447, and E. G. Hardy, *Catilinarian Conspiracy*, p. 19, is clearly erroneous.

(b) P. 92. 11 ff. Asconius quotes Cicero: 'Praetereo nefarium illum conatum tuum et paene acerbum et luctuosum rei publicae diem, cum Cn. Pisone socio, ne quem alium nominem, caedem optimatum facere voluisti.'

He comments: 'Quos nominat intellegitis. Fuit enim opinio Catilinam et Cn. Pisonem . . . coniurasse ad caedem senatus faciendam.' (The story follows of the plot and of Piso's tenure of Spain.)

I have given the manuscript reading. For *nominat* Mommsen proposed

¹ Cf. H. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (1938), pp. 39, 108.

innuat, and Kiessling and Schoell, followed by later editors, amended to *non nominet*. In their apparatus they refer to the passage already discussed; they evidently assume a dark hint that Crassus and Caesar were those whom Cicero did not name, and that Asconius saw this. This view is also taken by, for example, C. John, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte der catilinarischen Verschwörung* (1876), p. 723, L. Pareti, *La Congiura di Catilina* (1934), p. 26, and E. Manni, *Lucio Sergio Catilina* (1939), p. 31, and probably by Rice Holmes, loc. cit. But no such hint is implied in the fragment of Cicero, and the insertion of *non* in Asconius' note is not justified.

Cicero was attacking both Catiline and Antonius. He often refers to one of them by *tu* or *tuus*. It is Asconius' practice to identify the person attacked; cf., for example, 84. 4 and 12; 87. 29; 88. 23; 90. 15. So here Cicero speaks of *conatum tuum*, and Asconius says that there is a reference to Catiline, just as *tu* in the next fragment is said to refer to Antonius. Cicero also mentions Piso, perhaps for the first time; Asconius, who had referred to him before, now gives a full account. We may paraphrase: 'he means Catiline, and that particular Piso, whose history is as follows'.

On the editors' view Asconius says 'you understand who are the *men* Cicero does not name, as it was thought that Catiline and Piso plotted . . .'. This is surely absurd. It is also intolerably obscure. How could Asconius expect the reader to be reminded of an earlier passage in his notes, to which he does not refer them, where he cited evidence that one man (Crassus only), not several, was secretly behind the plot? Such obscurity is not in his manner: he is prone to explain the obvious, cf. 9. 10 'profecto intellegitis P. Clodium significari' and similar passages in 11. 7; 12. 1; 85. 27; 88. 25; 90. 6.

Clark cites 72. 10 for the omission of *non* before *nominat*. Clearly it is palaeographically easy to insert *non*. But the parallel is not in other ways exact. On p. 72 Asconius is commenting on a passage in which Cicero mentioned an *intercessor* but not by name, and he supplies the name. In the present case Cicero's phrase *ne quem alium nominem* is not descriptive and neither calls for nor elicits comment. I believe that Cicero meant 'not to speak of all the other conspirators', people of no note, and that Asconius so understood him. Otherwise, he would have told us explicitly whom, in his view, Cicero had in mind.

(c) P. 93. 10 ff.

'Dicit de malis civibus:

"Qui postea quam illo quo conati erant Hispaniensi pugiunculo nervos incidere civium Romanorum non potuerunt, duas uno tempore conantur in rem publicam sicas destringere."

'Hispaniensem pugiunculum Cn. Pisonem appellat, quem in Hispania occisum esse dixi. Duas sicas Catilinam et Antonium manifestum est.'

Cicero is drawing a contrast. The bad citizens previously used only a single instrument, and a feeble one (note the diminutive); now they are employing two. Since both Catiline and Piso were, according to Cicero, involved in the 'plot' of 66/65, the enterprise in which Piso alone is said to be the instrument must be distinct from it, and the adjective *Hispaniensis* makes it clear that he has in mind Piso's government of Spain. I conjecture that the phrase *nervos incidere civium Romanorum* refers to some (otherwise unattested) damage to the interests of citizens in the province (cf. the cases of Verres and Gabinius).

Who are the *mali cives* (Asconius' phrase)? Crassus had helped to secure

Piso's appointment (Sall. *Cat.* 19) and Caesar was said to have been involved with him in nefarious plans (Suet. *Iul.* 9—an unlikely story); hence it is thought by some that they are meant. Asconius lends no support. He probably understood Cicero to be speaking of the *grex Catilinae*. In any event (*contra* John, loc. cit.) there is no allusion here to their complicity in the 'plot' of 66/65.

The chief ground for supposing that Cicero is here referring to Crassus and Caesar is the belief that they were supporting the candidature of Catiline and Antonius. This is an article of faith with all the books, but it rests, apart from inferences and conjectural interpretations of the political situation, only on two passages of Asconius (83. 2 and 21), of which the second is explicitly and both are probably derived from Cicero's secret memoir. It is certainly curious that Cicero himself, even in intimate letters and even when he was most hostile to Crassus and Caesar, never alludes to their having backed these *sicae* against his own candidature. Much less, of course, does he charge them with being parties to Catiline's plots. All this was reserved for a posthumous, and perhaps defamatory, record.¹

Oriel College, Oxford

P. A. BRUNT

ON COMING OF AGE IN ATHENS

ATHENIAN boys, on attaining majority, were recorded each in the register of his deme or *ληξιαρχικὸν γραμματεῖον*. It is certain that this registration took place about the turn of the Attic year; for Demosthenes was registered shortly after an event occurring in Scirophorion 367/6.² Further, the archon appointed tragic choregi very soon after he took office;³ the speaker of Lysias xxi was recognized as of age in 411/10 and served as tragic choregus in the same year. So it would seem that registration took place at the beginning of the new year, not at the end of the old. That is the probable conclusion from the extant evidence—not certain, since the year 411/10 may have been irregular. It must also remain uncertain whether the registration of adoption of sons, which took place at the same time as the election of deme-officers,⁴ belonged to the same occasion as the registration of those attaining majority.

Not all boys are born on the same day or at the beginning of the Attic year. So the question arises, did boys come of age at the beginning of the year in which they had still to reach their eighteenth birthday or at the beginning of the year after their eighteenth birthday? A. Schaefer (*Demosthenes und seine Zeit*, iii¹ [1858], 2. 19 ff.), relying mainly on Demosthenic evidence, said that boys were registered when they were in their eighteenth year, that is, when they were seventeen years old. The discovery of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, whether written by Aristotle or by a member of his school, seemed to strengthen the

¹ Suet. *Iul.* 9. 2 quotes from a lost letter of Cicero to Axius, of unknown date but probably after Caesar's death, the phrase (not necessarily a verbal quotation): 'Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum de quo aedilis (65 B.C.) cogitavit.' The plan to 'massacre the senate' was thought out, if at all, in 66 and the phrase is too colourless to refer to it. Strasburger (op. cit., p. 108) suggested that he had in mind the lavish displays Caesar gave as aedile (Suet. 10. 2;

cf. Cic. *Phil.* ii. 116, which again gives no hint of Caesar's part in a conspiracy); one might also think of the illegal restoration of Marius' images (Plut. *Caes.* 6, where the context rebuts the view that Catulus' charge that Caesar was undermining the state was based on his being concerned in a plot to overthrow it by open violence).

² Dem. xxx. 15.

³ [Aristotle] *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 56. 2-3.

⁴ Isae. vii. 28; [Dem.] xlv. 39.

evidence for the alternative view. Accordingly, A. Hoeck (*Hermes*, xxx [1895], 347-54) said that boys came of age about the turn of the year after their eighteenth birthday, that is, when they were eighteen years old. His argument has been generally accepted.¹ Among the more important remarks of Demosthenes Hoeck ignored one and misinterpreted others.

Demosthenes² says that he was seven years old when his father died; he says repeatedly,³ in language that indicates exclusive reckoning, that he was under the care of his guardians for ten years. Simple addition suggests that Demosthenes was seventeen years old when he came of age. Hoeck was convinced by the Aristotelian evidence that boys did not attain majority till they were eighteen years old. So he made two assumptions to escape the apparent force of Demosthenes' statements. First, he held that Demosthenes may have been many months more than seven years old when his father died; he may have been nearly eight. For he might seek the sympathy of his jurors by suggesting that he was of very tender years when his guardians began to exploit him. This may be correct; it was suggested by Schaefer. Secondly Hoeck maintained that, even if the guardianship lasted a few months more than ten years, Demosthenes would still reckon it as merely ten years; in assessing what his guardians owed him for the use of his property he would ignore the proceeds of a mere few months. Then if both Hoeck's assumptions are correct, Demosthenes may have been eighteen years old when he came of age.

Hoeck's second assumption is inadmissible. When Demosthenes prosecuted Aphobus, he did not feel generous towards him; he wanted to convince the jury of the enormity of Aphobus' behaviour, he wanted to avenge himself as fully as possible. It is patently unlikely that the guardianship lasted precisely ten years; so if Demosthenes prefers the round figure, it would be right to suspect that the guardianship lasted some months less than ten years. Moreover, he once calls the period ten years by inclusive reckoning;⁴ likewise he once indicates⁵ that it was (7+2) years—Therippides had charge of the factory for seven years and Aphobus for two years. Because of these two passages the figure of ten years, when stated according to exclusive reckoning, should be regarded as an exaggeration of some months. Thus the guardianship lasted some months less than ten years; so even if Demosthenes was nearly eight when his father died, he cannot have been eighteen years old when he came of age.

Two more passages require attention. At xxvii. 63 Demosthenes says: 'If I had been left an orphan when I was one year old and had been under the guardianship of these men for a further six years, I would not even have regained these petty leaveings from them' (*εἰ κατελείφθην μὲν ἐνιαύσιος, ἐξ ἧρ δὲ πρὸς ἐπετροπεύθην ὑπ' αὐτῶν, οὐδ' ἂν τὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα παρ' αὐτῶν ἀπέλαβον*). Hoeck ignored this passage, as well he might. If a man says 'I mean (10+7)', it is possible to complain 'He is mistaken: he means eighteen'; but if he says 'I mean (10+7), that is (10+6+1)', it is prudent to infer that he means seventeen. The second passage, though relevant, is not at all decisive. At xxvii. 14 Demosthenes says that Aphobus, straight after taking over part of the

¹ e.g. Thalheim, *R.E.* v. 2737; Lipsius, *Attisches Recht*, ii. 282; Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. Staatskunde*, ii². 943.

² xxvii. 4.

³ xxvii. 6, 17, 24, 26, 29, 35, 36, 39, 59, 63; xxix. 34, 59; xxxi. 14. He reckons the period as (2+8) years at xxvii. 21-23; for the two

years cf. xxviii. 12.

⁴ xxvii. 69 μέγα δ' ἂν οἶμαι στενάξει τὸν πατέρ' ἡμῶν, εἰ αἰσθοίτο. . . . Αἰφροβὸν δὲ μηδ' ἦν ἔλαβεν προῖκ' ἐθέλοντ' ἀποδοῦναι, καὶ ταῦτ' ἔτει δεκάτῳ.

⁵ xxvii. 19. The 'seven years' correspond to the 'eight years' of xxvii. 23; cf. note 3.

property of the deceased Demosthenes, prepared to sail as trierarch to Corcyra. It is a reasonable conjecture that Aphobus served in the fleet which Timotheus commanded at Corcyra in 375;¹ he may have sailed in spring or early summer 375 or he may have been trierarch for 375/4. Then Demosthenes the elder died in 376/5 and probably not near the beginning of the year. Thus, if it is correct that Aphobus served under Timotheus, the guardianship lasted less than ten years.

The earliest possible date for the birth of Demosthenes can be estimated. If the guardianship lasted nearly ten years, his father died about the late summer of 376; then if he was already nearly eight years old, he was born about the autumn of 384. The opposite extreme can also be considered; but if his seventeenth birthday fell not later than midsummer 366, he was born not later than the end of the Attic year 384/3. Thus, as far as his statements are concerned, he may have been born at any time in 384/3 except in the first few months of the year.

The Demosthenic evidence clearly indicates that Athenian boys were enrolled in their deme-registers when they were seventeen years old and stood in their eighteenth year. The writer of *Att. Pol.* 42. 1-2 says no less clearly that Athenian boys were not enrolled thus until they were eighteen years old; he is doubtless the source for the lexicographers and scholiasts who repeat this information.² The possibility of a change in the law cannot be disproved but will hardly commend itself. The choice must depend on the relative likelihood of error in the two sources. The *Att. Pol.* is not above criticism in its historical chapters, but its description of the contemporary constitution seems to be sound. It was, however, written *θεωρίας ἔνεκα*. Demosthenes may have made false or deceptive statements in attacking Aphobus; yet he could derive no advantage from trying to deceive his jurors about the age of majority, an error on such a matter of common knowledge would merely make him look foolish. Mistakes in a learned inquiry do not bring such immediate consequences as mistakes in legal pleading. So the Demosthenic evidence is to be preferred.

University College of North Wales, Bangor

RAPHAEL SEALEY

PLATO, *TIMAEUS* 35 a 4-6

τῆς τε ταύτου φύσεως αὐτοῦ περὶ καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἑτέρου, καὶ κατὰ ταῦτά συνέστησεν κ.τ.λ.

This is Burnet's text, with the brackets round αὐτοῦ περὶ removed, as Cornford has convincingly argued that they should be. It is difficult to decide whether Proclus (*in Tim.* ii. 55-56, Diehl) wrote (or intended) κατὰ ταῦτά (or καὶ κατὰ ταῦτά), as both Taylor and Cornford believe, or κατὰ ταῦτα (or καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα), as in Diehl's text (without the καὶ). For whereas at 156. 18 and 23 κατὰ ταῦτά seems to give better sense, on the other hand at 55. 24 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων looks very much like Proclus' version of καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα. But whatever Proclus wrote, and thought Plato had written, I suggest that we

should write the Plato text (with a colon after εἶδες in a 4) thus: τῆς τε ταύτου φύσεως αὐτοῦ περὶ καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἑτέρου, καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα (ταῦτό) συνέστησεν κ.τ.λ.

'And again, as regards Sameness and Difference, in their case too he made the same sort of compound' etc.

My reasons are (a) that συνέστησεν surely must have an object expressed; (b) that the καὶ before κατὰ ταῦτά would be intolerably otiose, whereas before κατὰ ταῦτα it is natural enough.

There is, no doubt, a certain redundancy involved: καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα just picks up and repeats τῆς τε ταύτου . . . τοῦ ἑτέρου: but it is a redundancy as natural in Greek as in my English.

R. HACKFORTH

¹ Xen. *Hell.* v. 4. 63-66; cf. Diod. xv. 36. 5-6; the conjecture is Schaefer's.

² e.g. Harpoc. s.v. ἐφηβος; Bekker, *Anec.*

p. 255. 15; scholiasts on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 578; Dem. iii. 4; Aesch. iii. 122.

THUCYDIDES ii. 4. 4

οἱ δὲ κατὰ πόλιν ἐρήμους γυναικὸς δούσης πέλεκυν λαθόντες καὶ διακόφαντες τὸν μοχλὸν ἐξήλθον οὐ πολλοί.

The difficulties seem to be these. (1) The use of κατὰ in the sense 'by way of' is not noted in L.S.J. It is not the same use as κατὰ τὴν πόλιν in the same sentence. (2) γυναικὸς δούσης πέλεκυν is out of place: logically it belongs to διακόφαντες. (3) λαθόντες is out of place and belongs to ἐξήλθον. Strictly speaking, this party was not unseen as it was seen by one woman at least: this criticism may be pedantic. (2) and (3) suggest some displacements in text.

I suggest that logical order and (perhaps) Greek idiom would be restored by reading οἱ δὲ καταλαβόντες πόλιν ἐρήμους καὶ γυναικὸς δούσης πέλεκυν διακόφαντες τὸν μοχλὸν ἐξήλθον οὐ πολλοί.

For this use of καταλαμβάνειν, 'find on arrival' cf. Thuc. viii. 65, ii. 18, Plato, *Symp.* 174 d ἀνεπαγγέλην κ. τὴν θύραν.

H. J. DIXON

King's College School,
Wimbledon

THE LEX FUFIA

OF 59 B.C.

Dio records (xxxviii. 8. 1.) that Q. Fufius Calenus, while praetor in 59 B.C., was the author of a law introducing separate voting by the three orders so that the views of each might be made public. Asconius, however, seems to imply that separate voting was in existence as early as 65 B.C. when he says of the result of Catiline's trial in that year '... liberatus est Catilina, sed ita ut senatorum urna damnaret, equitum et tribunorum absolveret' (p. 89 Clark). This note hopes to show that Asconius is guilty of a laxity of expression which should in no way discredit Dio.

Of the nine trials of which Asconius records the results, four are earlier than 59 B.C. and five later.¹ In the trials taking place after 59 an exact tally of the votes given for and against by each order is made.² In the

¹ M. Scaurus and M. Silanus in 104, C. Cornelius and Catiline in 65, M. Scaurus M. f. in 54, Milo in 52, two trials of M. Saufeius and that of Sex. Clodius after Milo's trial.

² In the second trial of Saufeius, which Asconius is comparing with the first, he does not give the information quite so fully, but

trial of C. Cornelius, however, all we have is 'magno numero sententiarum Cornelius absolutus est' (p. 81), while the trials of the elder Scaurus and M. Silanus are the exceptions that prove the rule. Scaurus was arraigned *apud populum*, acquitted, and we are told how the tribes voted—three against and thirty-two for him. Of Silanus we hear that only two tribes voted against him and they are named. We may conclude, then, that in cases where exact information is available on how the voting went, Asconius gives it.

In his note giving the result of Catiline's trial Asconius only mentions two urnae, that of the senate and that of the equites and *tribuni aerarii*. He knew that the senate was hostile '... multaeque graves sententiae in senatu de eo dictae sunt' (p. 85) and he has already quoted a passage in which the non-senatorial members of the jury are upbraided by Cicero for their part in Catiline's acquittal 'mentitos esse equites Romanos, falsas fuisse tabellas honestissimae civitatis existimo...' (p. 87). The verdict of the trial is expressed in language appropriate to the separate voting of later trials but which only means that Asconius believed that the senators voted largely against Catiline, and the remainder for him, a belief for which he had good evidence before him. He does not give us the figures for the result of Catiline's trial because they were not there for him to give.

G. MACDONALD

Sherborne School

A JOKE ABOUT
CONSCRIPTION

Spartianus, *Vita Hadriani*, 12. 4

H. Peter in the 1884 Teubner text reads: 'Omnibus Hispanis in conuentum uocatis dilectumque ioculariter, ut uerba ipsa ponit Marius Maximus, retractantibus Italicis, uehementissime ceteris prudenter et caute consuluit' (sc. Hadrianus).

D. Magic (Loeb edition, 1922) translates: 'He (Hadrian) called the inhabitants of Spain to a general meeting, and when they refused to submit to a levy, the Italian settlers jestingly, to use the very words of Marius Maximus, and the others very vigorously, he took measures characterised by skill and

still includes the undistributed totals of the votes and how the voting of the orders changed.

³ For other examples in Cicero of *equites Romani* with this meaning see *pro Flacco* 4. and *pro Rab. Post.* 14.

discretion
of the I
exempted
(Vita Ma
safe.

The po
to get ei
S.H.A. is
to have
Italic? M
members
But does
of Italia
'home-to
emption
Peter's

the placin
mus, car
(Kaiser
'omnibus
uerba...
uehement
the Span
was no
pressed
them ser
in his ha

But io
evidently
bally rec
ing been
would h
peror's p

M. I.
Windu

The ti
general
to find
Odysse
might
poetry,
and th
spaciou
its me
accura
and so
togeth
of Gre

discretion'; the reason for the 'jocular'ity of the *Italici* being that they had been exempted from conscription by Trajan (*Vita Marci* 11. 7) and knew that they were safe.

The point is a trivial one, and the attempt to get either Latinity or sense out of the *S.H.A.* is often vain. But it may be permitted to have another try. (a) Who were the *Italici*? Magie has 'the Italian settlers'—i.e. members of all the Italian colonies in Spain. But does not *Italici* rather mean 'the citizens of *Italia*', Trajan's and Hadrian's ancestral 'home-town', who might well hope for exemption? (b) Who made the joke?

Peter's (and Magie's) punctuation, and the placing of the reference to Marius Maximus, can hardly be right. E. Kornemann (*Kaiser Hadrian*, 1905) punctuates thus: 'omnibus . . . dilectumque (ioculariter, ut uerba . . . Maximus) retractantibus, Italici uehementissime, ceteris . . . consuluit'—i.e. the Spaniards' protest, according to M.M., was no more than a joke, but the *Italici* pressed their objections and Hadrian took them seriously, showing tact and judgement in his handling of the whole situation.

But *ioculariter* and *uerba ipsa ponit* M.M. evidently refer to *facetiae* which were verbally recorded by Marius Maximus as having been uttered, not by the delegates (who would hardly try to be funny in the Emperor's presence), but by Hadrian himself.

Spartianus (or whoever was the compiler of the *Vita*) has found in his principal 'source' a plain account of the Spanish communities' protest against conscription and of Hadrian's dealing with it: his general 'tact and judgement', and his 'particular eagerness' to reassure his fellow-townsmen of *Italia*. This 'principal source' is identified by Kornemann as a nameless writer whom he calls 'der letzte grosse Historiker von Rom'; and similarly O. T. Schulz (*Leben des Kaisers Hadrian*, 1904) speaks of 'der sachlich-historische Autor, ein Historiker von einem Werte, wie ihn niemand für die Zeit des dritten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts vermüet hätte'—not uncharacteristic examples of the admiration conceived by German *Quellenforscher* for their own hypothetical identifications.

To this Spartianus has appended a note of something he has found in another 'source', whose name, at any rate, is known; to the effect that Hadrian cannot, after all, have taken the business so seriously, for he broke a jest on the delegates, the *ipsissima uerba* of which were recorded by Marius Maximus. This note, perhaps originally a marginal note, has got itself into the wrong place in the sentence—which, again, is not uncharacteristic of Spartianus or of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* at large.

A. F. GILES

University of Edinburgh

REVIEWS

THE HOMERIC WORLD

M. I. FINLEY: *The World of Odysseus*. Pp. 191. London: Chatto & Windus, 1956. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE title of Dr. Finley's illuminating and enjoyable book could mislead. The general reader, to whom the work is primarily addressed, may be disappointed to find in it no comprehensive survey of the heroic world and little about Odysseus himself. The specialist, especially when he has read the first chapter, might be inclined to dismiss the book as a popular introduction to Homer's poetry. This would be a pity, for there is much here to interest both the amateur and the professional classical scholar. Modern fashion favours the short, spacious title. Yet the verbose explicitness of the old-fashioned title-page had its merits. In that style Finley's book might have been presented, more accurately, if less attractively, as: 'Some explanations of the political, economic, and social organization of the heroic world as described by the two Homers, together with introductory chapters on the early Greeks, on the transmission of Greek literature, and on the composition and performance of the Homeric

poems: to which are added a bibliographical essay, a map, an index locorum, and a general index.'

In his first chapter Finley discusses the authorship of the Homeric poems, the names and origins of the early Greeks, their language and alphabet, the survival of Greek literature in general, and the Greek view of myths—wide ground to cover in twenty-five pages. On the question of authorship he says: 'In truth, it is probable that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which we read were the works of two men, not of one. . . . Modern students think . . . that the period between 750 and 650 B.C. was the century of this earliest literature.' He believes that the name 'Achaean' was not applied to the Greeks before 1350 B.C. (The statement that the name 'Hellenes' does not occur in Homer needs qualification in view of *Iliad* ii. 530 and 684). On the Greek attitude to myths he sensibly refutes the over-rationalistic view that miraculous stories, such as that of Helen's birth, were generally regarded in classical times as mere allegories or symbols: 'the bitterness of Xenophanes in the sixth century B.C. and of Plato in the fourth proves precisely that, with respect to myth, many of their fellow-citizens shared the Trobriander view [that myth is a living reality, believed to have once happened], or at least were closer to it than to the symbolist view'.

The second chapter surveys current views on oral transmission and interpolation, and on the chronology and historicity of Homer. (Finley continues to use this name freely, even in phrases like 'Homer's Nestor', leaving the reader to wonder which Homer he means.) 'The world of Odysseus' is defined as having most likely been in the tenth or ninth centuries: it contains, however, anachronistic fragments from both earlier and later dates (but does this term anachronism not beg the question of date in an undated poem?). The reader is warned that 'there must be something of a historian's licence' in attributing the world of Odysseus to these centuries. Fate shows some irony here, when an historical critic asks for the licence he denies to a poet. If Homer nods, he is dismembered: if his critics are a century or so astray in their reckoning—'tis but historian's licence'. Finley himself does not, indeed, misuse his historian's licence. But some may wish that he had not even applied for it.

In the remaining chapters Finley is on less deeply furrowed ground. Here he handles his material with freshness and insight, opening up new approaches and frequently finding satisfactory explanations for chronic problems. He discusses the status of the *δημιοεργοί*, *θῆτες*, and *θεράποντες*, the peculiarities of the Homeric *οἶκος*, the etiquette and economics of gifts, the significance of kinship, the monarchical system, the function of the assembly, the ethical standards of the Homeric heroes, and some aspects of Homer's theology. As a result of his analyses many incidents in the Homeric poems gain in significance. For example: the reason why Glaucus dwells at such length on his ancestry in *Iliad* vi. 145 ff. was the importance of the guest-friend relationship among the heroes; whatever the truth was about Achilles' relationship with Patroclus, what was generally indicated in the practice of pederasty by the Greeks was not an exclusive homosexuality but a full bisexuality; the *demos* was not represented in the assembly of the Ithacans in *Odyssey* xxiv because the blood feud concerned only aristocrats.

At times the predominantly sociological approach seems to have caused an inclination to depreciate the poet's intelligence and the subtlety of his characters. Penelope is dismissed as 'little more than a convenient "mythological

available character'' (a quotation from Rhys Carpenter). Eumaeus and Eurycleia are 'stock types'. What justification is there for assuming an assured knowledge of pre-Homeric myth and characterization like this? Where is the stock of noble swineherds that Eumaeus was derived from? Further, in arguing that the suitors were more interested in Odysseus' kingship than in his wife Finley admits a difficulty. Why was the choice left to Penelope? He refuses to allow that there was anything about her 'either in beauty or wisdom or spirit, that could have won her this unprecedented and unwanted right of decision'. He suggests: 'Perhaps the Penelope situation became so muddled in the long prehistory of the *Odyssey* that the actual social and legal situation is no longer recoverable'. But could it not be that the suitors actually were suitors—their number, persistence, and patience being Homer's tribute to the beauty, wisdom, and spirit of his Penelope—and that the muddle comes from a wrong interpretation, not from the prehistory, of the poem?

A short consideration of the value—almost negligible, Finley thinks—of the Mycenaean tablets as evidence for Homeric society and a bibliographical essay complete this wide-ranging, and in many ways original, book.

Trinity College, Dublin

W. B. STANFORD

THE OLYMPIAN ODES OF PINDAR

MANUEL FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO: Pindaro, *Olimpicas*. (Clasicos 'Emerita'.) Pp. 345. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956. Paper.

THIS useful book is basically a reprint of its first edition (two volumes, same publisher, 1944), which was not reviewed in *C.R.* That edition went to press when Fernandez-Galiano was twenty-four: it has now been revised throughout. The commentary takes some account of recent work, with which the editor, as readers of *Emerita* know, is well acquainted, but in general it has been very little changed. In the Introduction the chief novelty is the section dealing with the manuscripts, which has been entirely recast, chiefly in view of the work of Turyn and Irigoin. There is no critical apparatus, and the eclectic text prints only readings adopted by one or more recent editors. In 1944 the editor listed all his divergencies from Puech, and now (p. 27) he lists all those from Snell.

The excellent Introduction gives, among much else, a brief account of the Olympian sanctuary (now illustrated by Schleif's 1943 plan) and of the Great Games, followed by discussions of the dates of the Olympian odes and by an account of Pindar's life and art and of his general outlook, especially in religion. Besides the section on the manuscripts there is a brief section on metre, and a long account of Pindar's language (pp. 28–72). This last is a matter to which the editor has paid close attention (see his review of Turyn's edition in *Emerita* xiii, 1945). Much of this section is strictly philological and I do not feel competent to appraise it, but the more general portions are good, though some of his generalizations are questionable, for instance what he says on p. 63 about the extreme rarity in Pindar of the definite article.

This linguistic section is intentionally of a more advanced character than the general commentary, and the editor explains (p. 80) that he has relegated it to the Introduction for the benefit of systematic students of Pindar's dialect.

The general commentary, as he explains, is designed for the use of good university students. Much of it strikes an English reader as somewhat elementary, but both the introductions and the notes to the several odes are clear and sensible and do not shirk difficulties of reading or interpretation. Naturally there are many points where other scholars will adopt a different view and some where he is demonstrably at fault. To take two examples from the Second Olympian, of which his treatment is in general excellent, it is hard to agree that in l. 13 κορυφάν (ἀέθλων) is not metaphorical but refers to the hill of Kronos, and the note on l. 45, which, like that on l. 13, goes back to the first edition, is indefensible. It runs: 'Ἀδραστιδᾶν] Ἀδραστιδῶν; de hecho sólo se trataba de una Ἀδραστῆς, la madre de Tersandro, Argia, hija de Adrasto. El plural es poético.' This is taken straight from the scholia: 80 a runs: 'Ἀδραστειδᾶν: ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνικοῦ πληθυντικῶς ἐξήνεγκεν· ἔστι γὰρ Ἀδραστειδῶς· ἐκ μᾶς γὰρ τῆς Ἀδράστου θυγατρὸς Ἀργείας γέγονε . . .', and 80 b continues: τὸ δὲ Ἀδραστειδᾶν οὐ περισπαστέον· ἔστι γὰρ θηλυκὸν καὶ ἔχει τὴν εὐθείαν Ἀδραστῆς, τῶν Ἀδραστειδῶν· τὸ γὰρ ἀρσενικὸν περισπᾶται, οἱ Ἀδραστειδαί, τῶν Ἀδραστειδῶν: 81 b (from the Ambrosianus) says much the same.

Fernandez-Galiano has failed to observe that the scholiasts' explanation is irrelevant to the text which he himself prints (with Ἀδραστιδᾶν): they are trying to explain the (unmetrical) reading Ἀδραστειδᾶν, however accented, which they found in their texts, and they took it, despite its final -αν, to be the genitive plural of Ἀδραστῆς, 'daughter of Adrastus'. Like some of the early editors of the printed editions they probably detached Ἀδραστειδᾶν from δόμοις, which they left in the air: 'Est autem Syntaxis', writes Erasmus Schmid, ' . . . ἀρωγὸν δόμοις, πατρικοῖς scilicet.' The ε in Ἀδραστῆς, the ill-invented name which Fernandez-Galiano takes over bodily from the scholiasts, is due solely to the ε which they found in Ἀδραστειδᾶν: the correct form would, of course, be Ἀδραστῆς, with genitive plural Ἀδραστιδῶν, and the forms are in fact so spelt by the Ambrosian scholiast.

Apart, moreover, from linguistic difficulties, this line of explanation misses the point of the expression Ἀδραστιδᾶν θάλος ἀρωγὸν δόμοις, namely that Polynices, by marrying Argia and begetting Thersander, helped to save the blood of Adrastus, as well as that of the Theban γένος ἀρήϊον, from extinction: as Puech translates, 'il fut le rejeton qui fit revivre la famille des Adrastides'.

It would be unfair not to add that I have noticed no comparable confusions elsewhere in the commentary.

The metrical matter in the volume is not confined to the brief section of the Introduction. The editor has rewritten, on what he calls 'traditional' lines, the traditional forewords to the several odes, but he has substituted for the schemes, based on Puech, which he gave in the first edition, simple diagrams of longs and shorts, showing only period divisions. He also offers a complete analysis of each dactylo-epitrite ode in Maas's notation, and similar analyses in A. M. Dale's notation of all the rest, and on pp. 105 and 158 he briefly explains both these systems. For Miss Dale's he does not depend solely on her articles in *C.Q.* 1950 and 1951, since she herself, with characteristic generosity, has supplied him with her unpublished analyses.

Other features calling for mention are the good chronological table, the family trees of Hieron and Theron, and the index of proper names. Almost all this matter is repeated, with slight modifications, from the first edition. The Bibliography has received many additions, further supplemented in the 'Ad-

denda et Corrigenda', but the list of 'Comentarios a aspectos particulares', which in 1944 contained a dozen entries, has been dropped.

There is a new frontispiece, a photograph of the British Museum 'Anacreon' head (identical with that of the Copenhagen seated figure, but better preserved), which Schefold, followed by Picard, believes to represent Pindar. It is a pity that the reader is given no information at all about its identity or location.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. S. ROBERTSON

XENOPHANES

MARIO UNTERSTEINER: *Senofane, Testimonianze e Frammenti*, Introduzione, traduzione e commento. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, xxxiii.) Pp. cclxxx+155. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 4,000.

THIS volume gives us the Greek text of Xenophanes' fragments and testimonia with Italian translation facing and commentary at the foot of the page. It is intended as the first of several to be devoted to the Eleatics and follows the pattern of the three volumes in the same series dealing with the sophists. The text and numeration are those of Diels-Kranz, with only occasional departures. Of these the most noteworthy is Untersteiner's own conjecture of ἐσθλ' ἐπιών in B 1. 19 in place of ἐσθλὰ πίων to which H. Fränkel had already taken exception (*Dichtung und Philosophie*, p. 422, n. 3).

The long introduction discusses most of the problems raised by the attempt to interpret the thought of Xenophanes, and the argument is regularly forthright and provocative. In two cases in particular new ground is broken—in the discussion of the value and origin of the section dealing with Xenophanes in the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De Melisso Xenophane Gorgia*, and in the discussion of Xenophanes' conception of God. First in the case of *M.X.G.* Untersteiner rightly draws attention to the paradox in the situation usually supposed to obtain: the section dealing with Gorgias is commonly regarded as a most valuable source of information as to the contents of Gorgias' treatise *Περὶ φύσεως* and the treatment of Melissus is accepted as informed and generally reliable. But the section on Xenophanes is commonly supposed to be muddled, mistaken, and valueless. Untersteiner is right also to draw attention to the value of the critical passages in *M.X.G.* for the determination of the authorship of the treatise. In the past *M.X.G.* has usually been regarded as Peripatetic in origin, though the absence of specifically Peripatetic features led Diels eventually to ascribe it to the Peripatos of the first century A.D. Untersteiner supposes that it was written by a member of the Megarian school of philosophers towards the end of the fourth century, by someone like Metrodorus or Timagoras who became Megarians after being pupils of Theophrastus.

This view is supported by arguments both general and particular. There is first the choice of just these three authors for discussion, Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias, and there is secondly the presence of critical and polemical passages in the treatise. From this Untersteiner rightly infers a special interest in Eleaticism and its problems and a desire to revise the solutions previously offered. He then argues (p. xxiii) that the only school preoccupied with the reform of Eleaticism was the Megarian. This is not convincing. The problem of predication in relation to the One and the Many underlies all discussions in

M.X.G. The same problem was certainly the concern of the Megarians, but it was of the greatest concern to some of the sophists in the fifth century, and from them it passed as a legacy to the whole of fourth-century philosophy and not to the Megarians only. Next Untersteiner argues that the doxographic interest revealed in *M.X.G.* shows the influence of the doxographic studies of Theophrastus. But this is not a necessary inference. The important and unfortunately little-known article by Professor Bruno Snell, 'Die Nachrichten über die Lehren des Thales und die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte' (*Philologus*, xcvi [1944], 170-83), makes it clear that a strong interest in doxography went back to the period of the sophists, especially to Hippias.

However, it is the particular arguments offered and not these general considerations which must determine the issue. Untersteiner seeks to show a particular correspondence between Megarian doctrine and the arguments in *M.X.G.* The case is presented with much subtlety of argument and will require detailed consideration. But the difficulty seems to be that while there are undoubted similarities in argument these fall short of establishing a common origin in the Megarian school, and the careful reader will probably arrive at a verdict of 'not proven'.

Untersteiner finds the key to Xenophanes' conception of God in the primitive conception of *mana*. This as *Γαῖα* lies at the basis of his physics, as *νοῦς* provides the rational element in the universe, and as *φύσις* is a source of movement though itself unmoved. The unmoved character of God is explained as expressing 'the idea of immobility inherent in the concept of *φύσις*' (p. clxxxix). But was there ever such an idea inherent in the concept of *φύσις*? Throughout Untersteiner sees Xenophanes as searching for unity by synthesizing a dialectically opposed multiplicity in ever higher groups culminating in a pantheism which might be called 'panrationalism'. This thorough-going Hegelianism when applied to Xenophanes has the disconcerting result (for the non-Hegelian!) that conflicting evidence ceases to be in ultimate conflict, and, for example, inconsistent statements in ancient authors about the doctrine of the soul in Xenophanes may both be substantially correct. To the present reviewer this seems a very hazardous path to tread.

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFERD

GREEK COMEDY

KATHERINE LEVER: *The Art of Greek Comedy*. Pp. xi+212. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 21s net.

THIS is a history of Greek comedy from the beginnings to the death of Menander. The first three chapters bring us to 430; then follow three on Aristophanes, one on Middle Comedy, and one on New Comedy. It will be seen that this scheme makes no provision for Aristophanes' contemporaries; and one of the most surprising features of the book is the absence of any attempt at a systematic discussion of Eupolis. Apart from one or two passing references, he is dismissed in half a page (p. 105) with a footnote referring the reader to Kock and Norwood and Kaibel's article in *R.E.*: the *Demes* is not mentioned. Scarcely less surprising is the almost complete neglect of the lost plays of

Aris
and
sion
shar
spun
T
who
tran
supp
poet
the
intel
if on
the
read
Men
the
help
as it
insta
when
tack
(p. 4
136
final
para
TI
does
anot
char
rhen
is us
surp
inde
Birds
on p
inac
para
tivel
TI
(Epi
298
δωρή
deme
very
δλίγα
(p. 1
and
'in c
of Ep

Aristophanes. On the other hand, Epicharmus, Cratinus, Crates, Pherecrates, and Teleclides are discussed in some detail, though here too there are omissions, such as the plot of Cratinus' *Πντίνη*. Some topics get more than their share of space; in particular, too much is made of Susarion and the (certainly spurious) misogynist fragment, which incidentally is not in Ionic.

The book is intended for those who do not know Greek as well as for those who do: Greek words are transliterated (except in the footnotes) and quotations translated. No knowledge of the history of Greek literature and thought is presupposed, and brief notes on such topics as early lyric, elegiac, and iambic poetry, pre-Socratic philosophy, and the Sophists are accordingly inserted at the appropriate chronological points. But it is virtually impossible to give an intelligible account of these subjects in the space available here, especially if one tries, as Dr. Lever does, to treat them generally, not confining oneself to the aspects especially relevant in a book on Comedy. On the other hand, the reader is expected to be conversant with the plays of Aristophanes and Menander: individual passages and characters are mentioned allusively from the outset, and we are not given summaries of the plots, which would have been helpful. We also need a single full description of the structure of Old Comedy: as it is, fragments of such a description are scattered all over the place. For instance, the parabasis is first briefly mentioned in the discussion of origins, where we are told that in it 'current political and literary problems were tackled in a humorous way and individuals of notoriety assailed by name' (p. 43). Then a brief sketch of its structure is given on pp. 110-11; next, on p. 136 we are told that the two odes are frequently invocations of the gods; finally on pp. 152-3 the structure is described again, more fully, and the parabasis of the *Knights* analysed.

This fragmentary method of exposition, which is typical of much of the book, does not make for clarity: and sometimes also two fragments contradict one another, e.g. on p. 136 it is implied, correctly, that the Chorus resume their character for the ode of the parabasis; on p. 152 we are told that 'in the epirrhema of the *Knights*, the Chorus reverts to character'. (The term 'epirrhema' is used without explanation on p. 111, then explained on p. 152—as it is, surprisingly, in LSJ⁹—as the words 'following after' the parabasis.) There are, indeed, several inconsistencies: Dr. Lever seems uncertain who is the hero of the *Birds* (on pp. 99 and 114 it seems to be Euelpides), Ibycus comes from Rhegium on p. 20 and is a Sicilian on p. 21. Besides inconsistencies, the writing is often inaccurate: e.g. on p. 138 'the first ode of the *Clouds*' means the ode of the parabasis in that play. Misprints and false references, however, are relatively rare.

The translations of the quotations are unbelievably inaccurate. On p. 52 (Epicharmus fr. 87) *ἐρανος* is translated 'lover'. In the translation of *Clouds* 298 ff. (p. 91) *ἐλθωμεν . . . ὀφόμεναι* is rendered 'we come . . . beholding' and *δαρήματα* 'temples'; *Ach.* 642 (p. 90) 'he has shown the people how to govern democratically'; *Knights* 556 ff. (p. 137) 'distinguishing themselves . . . by being very unlucky'; Antiphanes fr. 2 (p. 168) *συμφορά* 'convenience'; fr. 58 (p. 180) *ὀλίγον ἐστὶ τὸ καλὸν πανταχοῦ* must mean 'the fine is everywhere scarce'; fr. 204 (p. 170) *στρατηγήσας* is translated 'going to law'; fr. 240 (p. 174) *ἄξος* 'bitter' and *πρὸς γὰρ τὸ γῆρας ὥσπερ ἐργαστήριον | ἅπαντα τὰνθρώπεια προσφοιτᾷ κακά* 'in old age, as in a workshop, all mortal things go bad'. The title of a play of Epicharmus *Ἡρακλῆς ὁ πᾶρ Φόλῳ* does not mean 'H. against P.' (p. 47).

Nor is this inaccuracy confined to the translations: on p. 96 we are told that the war was resumed (after the Peace of Nicias) in 413; on p. 102 'Cleisthenes' should be 'Cleonymus'. The facts about the number of comedies produced at the Athenian dramatic festivals are misstated on p. 105 (cf. p. 44).

Apart from palpable inaccuracies, the style is often obscure, e.g. (p. 21) 'Though Sappho did not to our knowledge write political poems, she was not above speaking contemptuously of her brother's mistress.' One cannot help wondering what conception of the *agon* would be formed by a reader whose sole knowledge of it was derived from the paragraph on p. 153. The description of Sophocles *Antigone* (pp. 66-67) suggests that Antigone is on the stage at the end of the play.

Nevertheless the book contains some good criticism, and in particular Dr. Lever avoids the mistake of representing Aristophanes as a jester and nothing more by selecting and treating his material without regard for anything but its comic possibilities. The best parts of the book are to be found in the chapters on Aristophanes and Menander: in the sections on lost plays (especially Middle Comedy) too much space is devoted to isolated fragments, quoted (as by Stobaeus) with no regard for dramatic content, and too little to fragments from which some dramatic significance can be extracted, and to titles, which are often informative. Indeed Menander might have been given more space at the expense of Middle Comedy. There is a tendency to be too schematic, e.g. 'Magnes, Cratinus and Crates represent respectively the three main strands from which comedy was woven' (p. 81) and to indulge in reckless generalization, e.g. 'This flight from reality is the distinguishing characteristic of Middle Comedy' (p. 168). Sometimes, too, an apposite example is overlooked: e.g. the Sausage-seller's account of his success in the Boule (*Knights* 624 ff.) might have been mentioned under 'descriptions of scenes offstage' (p. 147).

A few points of detail: p. 43, 'The "horses" (in a chorus of knights) would have found it difficult to dance with knights upon their backs'. The 'riders' would dismount very soon after the entry of the chorus: cf. Pohlenz, 'Ar. Ritter' (*Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Kl. 1952, p. 110, n. 30). P. 49, 'The Hip-Joint' (title of a play by Epicharmus): the meaning of *περίαλλος* is as uncertain as the content of the play. P. 73, in the translation of the Oxyrhynchus argument of Cratinus 'Dionysalexander' (reproduced from Norwood) the supplement $\phi\langle\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \pi\rho\acute{o}s\rangle\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \Delta\lambda.$ (l. 25) must be rejected in favour of Wilamowitz's $\phi\langle\omicron\beta\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\rangle\ \tau\acute{o}\nu$, which Körte came to accept (cf. Bursian, 1911, p. 255). Pp. 74-75, the references to Cratinus' *Πλοῦτοι* take no account of the papyrus (first published in 1934 and now accessible most conveniently in D. L. Page's *Loeb Greek Literary Papyri*, pp. 196 ff.) which makes it clear that the main feature of the plot was the return to earth by gods of wealth to investigate the methods by which Hagnon and other rich Athenians had amassed their fortunes. P. 76 and n. 51 (p. 87), there is no evidence that the plots of Pherecrates' 'Petale' or 'Old Women' had anything in common with *Ecclesiazusae*. P. 91, 'Peisetairus' is probably a better correction of the name of the hero of the *Birds* than 'Pisthetairus', cf. Dobree, *Adv.* ii. 213. P. 175, the *Asotodidascales* of Alexis, from which fr. 25 comes, is probably spurious (cf. Arnott in *C.Q.*, n.s. v. 210 ff.).

There is, as has been said, some sound criticism in this book: and the author knows her Aristophanes well enough to quote him readily and fluently. But

the book ought never to have been published in its present condition, and the need of a history of Greek Comedy to replace Norwood remains.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

GREEK DRAMA

H. D. F. KITTO: *Form and Meaning in Drama*. Pp. viii+341. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 30s. net.

THE starting-point of this book is the conception of 'religious drama', which is defined as 'a form of drama in which the real focus is not the Tragic Hero but the divine background'. In all serious drama there is some awareness of the 'condition of humanity'; and I take it that by religious drama Kitto means something more positive than this. The tragic poet has a belief and the weight of the play is so distributed as to bring it out. Our own predominantly secular tradition makes us slow to appreciate this kind of writing. In order to arrive at the meaning we must follow the logic of the play to its conclusion, and the logic of a play is, of course, something quite different from the logic of ordinary life. Some of the best parts of the book are those in which the ground is cleared by the removal of irrelevancies which arise through the application of the wrong sort of logic, and we find the weapons of Tycho von Wilamowitz used for ends which would have surprised their inventor. Another principle is that Aeschylus is 'a competent dramatist' and Sophocles faultless, a principle which serves to express the author's irritation with those who try to explain drama in terms of historical development. The *Oresteia* is the subject of the first three chapters, the *Philoctetes*, *Antigone*, and *Ajax* of the next three. The final chapter, in which the same principles are applied to *Hamlet*, is introduced by an interesting discussion of the differences between Greek and Elizabethan drama and of the nature of religious drama in general.

The structure of the *Oresteia* has been analysed before. It is no small tribute to Kitto that a reviewer who has read more such analyses than is perhaps good for anyone should take unmixed pleasure in the first sixty pages of this book. In the second half, however, of the chapter on the *Eumenides*, when the logic of the trilogy is worked out, the eyebrows begin to rise. The theology with which the Greek poets are credited is both sophisticated and comprehensive. Kitto has already indicated his view in his contribution to the work on the Greek conception of the Divine reviewed in *C.R.*, n.s. vi (1956), 119 f. The gods are largely immanent, and the many gods are largely aspects of Zeus. An initial arbitrary intervention may be necessary to set an action in motion; for instance, the oracle which Laius received was such an intervention, but for the rest what happens is in accordance with the laws by which the universe is governed: 'the god does nothing to bring about the catastrophe. This occurs because everybody concerned is just what he is, and not something different.' This is not quite true; they might have been just as they were and lived happily ever after, had not Oedipus and Laius met under Parnassus. This very unlikely event was $\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta$. In the *Oresteia* we have the further complication that the immanent power is subject to development in time. Zeus' Dike required the punishment of Paris by the crime of Agamemnon and of the crime of Agamemnon by the crime of Clytaemnestra. The unending series finds an end in the *Eumenides* because Zeus, as in the *P.V.*, has developed. Apollo too in his

association with Cassandra appears as embodying a crude and vindictive idea of Justice. In the *Choephoroi* he is transformed, in that the pursuit of justice by Orestes and Electra is pure and no longer vindictive. His quiet disappearance in the *Eumenides* shows that he has been superseded. An advantage which follows from this partial evisceration of the gods is that it puts us in a fair way to escape the old contradiction of human responsibility combined with divine initiative. All actions fit in with the divine plan because it incorporates the law in accordance with which all actions must work themselves out. The same action is human or divine as it is regarded from one angle or the other. Kitto is most persuasive in showing how all this follows from the logic of the trilogy, so long as we assume that certain inconsistencies are inconceivable. Many will think the inconsistencies more easily conceivable than the conclusions.

The principle that in a play of Sophocles it is always right to look for a further explanation rather than accept a fault is defended on the ground that 'there is nothing in the nature of art which makes absolute perfection impossible, seeing that all its material is invented by, and is under the control of, the artist'. This may be true of music, with reference to which the statement was made. It is hardly true of Sophocles, whose material was myth which he did not handle with unlimited freedom. Each myth presents its own problems, and it may well be that these are never completely soluble. Nor is it as if Sophocles had spent his whole life in distilling his meaning into seven plays; they are not much more than a twentieth of his whole production. Further, we are told that a quality which ancient critics were agreed in finding in his work was *ἀνωμαλία*. 'It does no good to the work of any artist to approach it with bated breath', wrote Waldo. His attitude sometimes led him to dismiss perfectly real problems with undue airiness. But this opposite attitude, a very ecstasy of reverence, has its own dangers; the critic overloads a play with meaning because he finds maximum significance everywhere. For example the Haemon scene in the *Antigone* is very well in itself and has an obvious place in the economy of the play. But Kitto will have it that the enormity of Creon's failure to respect his son's love is on a level with the enormity of his failure to respect Antigone's scruples about her brother's burial. 'Both attempt to override something that is fundamental in human life; both are irreligious.' Nor can we be argued into satisfaction with what does not satisfy; we have the old problem of the end of the *Ajax*; the final scenes 'develop naturally out of the conception of Wisdom which we have been considering, and they lead to a climax which is something more profound than the vindication of Ajax'. Of the four characters who speak after the death of Ajax two are contemptible, and of course are meant to be so, and two, though deserving of approval, are lay figures. Their conflict cannot greatly excite us. It may be that this was the best possible solution of the problem of dramatizing what Sophocles set himself to dramatize. For all the skill and eloquence of scholar-critics the 'laughable' comment of the scholiast at 1123 will continue to awaken a response among readers, even if it is not a response to which they will all care to confess.

Kitto shows himself in his introduction well aware of the danger of emphasizing the meaning of a play as a thing which can be isolated from the play as a whole. Yet it is very difficult for a man to ponder a play in his study, pursuing its logic from clue to clue, without losing sight of essentials. There may be no fault in the logic that leads to the conclusion that 'the really theological end' of the *Philoctetes* is the 'idea that the Atreidae and Odysseus are frustrated by

what they themselves have done . . . that men like Odysseus, with their apparently clever arguments and schemes, are morally repulsive and politically disastrous, because what they attempt to do runs counter to the will of the gods, or the whole order of things, which is Dike'; this is an unexceptionable view with which Sophocles would probably have agreed, but remote from the experience of seeing or reading the play. Further, these meanings are such poor little mice to be cast up out of the travails of Sinai. It is no fault of Kitto's; they always are. Accordingly, I am led more and more to doubt whether a cut-and-dried meaning of this type was ever in the mind of Sophocles when he wrote a play, or at any rate his later plays, and whether Aeschylus, who clearly was wrestling with meaning, ever got it sorted out with anything like the clarity with which Kitto sorts it out for him. A useful hint of what really happens when genius is at work is possibly to be found in a recently published letter of George Eliot: 'my writing is simply a set of experiments in life—an endeavour to see what our thoughts and endeavours may be capable of . . . I become more and more timid—with less daring to adopt any formula which does not get itself clothed for me in some human figure and individual experience.' No doubt the business of scholarship must go on, but it is open to question how much is achieved by reducing to an intellectual formula what has its birth in the author's mind as an experience of the imagination.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

PLATO'S PHILOSOPHY

RUPERT C. LODGE: *The Philosophy of Plato*. Pp. ix+347. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956. Cloth, 28s. net.

PROFESSOR LODGE adds to his previous contributions yet another book on Plato for the general reader. The late Professor G. C. Field (in the 'Home University Library' series) has provided perhaps the most satisfactory recent work on the subject for readers in this country, and one might well question the desirability of a non-specialist in the field of ancient philosophy, such as Lodge appears to be, writing for other non-specialists about a philosopher who makes the utmost demands upon writers who have made ancient philosophy and particularly Plato their special study.

Although Lodge has given his book a comprehensive title, there is much absent that a study of Plato at such length might have been expected to include. For example, there is virtually no treatment of Plato's views of the soul, its nature and immortality, and the reader would not derive an adequate notion of the importance of the soul in Plato's eyes.

For this, and for much else in the book, there seems to be one major cause, the eccentric position, allied to that of Burnet and Taylor, which Lodge adopts on the Socratic question. 'Plato's hero "Socrates" differs from the authentic, historical Socrates. . . . Plato's *persona* is . . . Socrates idealized, presented as if he were always what Socrates would be at his best, the true, essential Socrates, an ideal case of Socrates. We call this, the "Platonic" Socrates, Plato's "idea" of Socrates' (p. viii). Most students of Plato would probably not agree that, for example, the tri-partite soul of the *Republic* is to be attributed to 'the true, essential Socrates', but would hold that here the Socrates of the *Republic* develops a doctrine of which Plato himself was the author.

Lodge's view, according to which the 'Socratic dialogues' are not merely the slighter early works but 'the Dialogues in which Socrates is presented as the chief speaker' (p. 89), continually leads him to adopt the position that if we want to find what Plato himself believed we must turn to some of the later dialogues, and especially the *Laws* from which Socrates is absent. Lodge seems to rely heavily for this view on a passage (314 c) in the Second Letter. He writes: 'The conventional conception of Plato as an other-worldly idealist . . . rests upon a study of the Socratic Dialogues only; those Dialogues of which Plato writes (in the well-known *Epistle*). "In these you will find, NOT opinions of Plato, but only Socrates, made young and handsome"' (pp. 261-2; cf. p. 293). The passage (and its fellow in the Seventh Letter, 341 c) is certainly difficult. It runs: διὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲν πώποτε ἐγὼ περὶ τούτων γέγραφα, οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται, τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστὶν καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος i.e. 'That is why I myself have never written on these subjects, nor is there any composition of Plato's nor will there be. Those now so called belong to Socrates resurrected.' Even granting that the reference here is to the early and middle dialogues in which Socrates leads the conversation, Lodge's position has its own difficulties. Plato's disclaimer seems to apply to the future (οὐδ' ἔσται) no less than to the present. Further, in the later dialogues various speakers (an Eleatic visitor, Timaeus, an Athenian visitor) take the leading position when vacated by Socrates, and there seems no authority for Lodge to suppose them in a more privileged position than Socrates so far as representing Plato's own views is concerned. Whatever may be the solution, Lodge's view does not seem satisfactory, even assuming the Letter genuine.

Lodge treats the philosophy of Plato under four heads: ethics, aesthetics, religion, education. Each of these is treated pretty much according to a set pattern, viz. (1) Plato's idea of Hellenic commonsense views. (2) Plato's idea of Hellenic factual science (Heracleitus). (3) Plato's idea of mathematical science (the Pythagoreans). (4) Plato's idea of the humanist movement (Protagoras, Gorgias, and others). (5) Plato's idea of critical idealism (Socrates) (p. ix). Thereafter, 'I try to bring out, clearly and precisely, what Plato, as Plato, in addition to depicting the views of others, is doing' (p. ix). Apart altogether from the objections which might be raised to Lodge's whole conception of Plato's method, this Procrustean approach removes whatever life and interest the subjects might otherwise have been given, and leads to much tedious repetition.

Lodge's understanding of Plato is often open to serious challenge. To take a fundamental example: his understanding of the theory of Ideas permits him, as already noted, to speak of Plato's "idea" of Socrates, as though Plato would have been willing to recognize any Idea more proximate to Socrates than the Idea of Man. Lodge summarizes his view of the theory as follows (p. 324): 'There is no evidence (so far as my understanding of the text goes) that Plato believes in the actuality of such transcendent ideas. His ideals appear to be used (as Kant would say) "regulatively": in order to guide and direct our procedures. . . . This means that Plato's "ideas" are to be understood (as authoritative professors teach us), not metaphysically (ontologically), but methodologically.'

This view is unlikely to command much support today, and it is significant that the 'authoritative professors' referred to are Natorp writing in 1903 and J. A. Stewart in 1909. Inspection of Lodge's Bibliography ('a list of books and

papers which I have found useful in interpreting special points'), where the majority of the books concerned with Plato were written before 1914, only confirms the antiquated impression given by the text. One wonders in particular why Cornford is nowhere mentioned, although Lodge has so much to say about the very dialogues upon which Cornford composed his commentaries in this self-same series. Taylor ('my father Parmenides' as Lodge calls him, p. 197) is taken as the authoritative expositor of the *Timaetus*, and *Timaetus* is unequivocally 'a Pythagorean' (p. 226). Burnet is followed for the Pre-Socratics ('For the evidence from Anaximander (and other early Hellenic philosophers), I would be considered as referring, at all points, to Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy*', p. 36), as though much vital work had not been done in this field in the last half-century, particularly with regard to the whole outlook and intentions of these early thinkers.

It is pleasant by contrast to find matter for applause in the book's final pages. Lodge seems to be right when he says of Popper and others (p. 324): 'Most critics (as I understand them) criticize Plato for being an ancient Greek, instead of a contemporary scientist or philosopher. They push him back into his past, and have no serious difficulty in showing that this past does not possess the knowledge, the beliefs, and some of the insights, of our own time. . . . Is this line of criticism particularly worth while?' Lodge's final judgement (p. 325) also seems worth repeating, even though it only represents one side of Plato's genius: 'What Plato really does, is to ask us, whatever our actual political affiliations, to live in a more ideal spirit, and to co-operate with other men of goodwill, in making this world a better place for all of us, in so far as betterment can be brought about by an increase of knowledge and wisdom.'

Queens' College
Cambridge

J. R. TREVASKIS

THE *PHILEBUS* AND *EPINOMIS*

Plato, *Philebus* and *Epinomis*. Translation and Introduction by A. E. TAYLOR. Edited by R. Klibansky, with the co-operation of G. Calogero and A. C. Lloyd. Pp. vi+272. London: Nelson, 1956. Cloth, 21s. net.

SOME manuscripts by the late Professor A. E. Taylor have been, as we are informed in somewhat romantic terms, 'discovered' and 'unearthed' by Mr. Klibansky. Actually they were lodged in Edinburgh University Library in 1946, the year after Taylor's death, where apparently they were neither lost nor buried. Parts of this work are being published in two volumes, of which this is the first. Its contents are thought to have been completed by Taylor in 1933 or 1934. Those who have had experience of coping with Taylor's handwriting will admire the skill and care with which it has been spelt out and printed. Only in a few places might one doubt the reading, as at p. 83, l. 14, where I would suggest replacing 'haply' by 'happy' in the phrase 'making haply divinations'.

The translations are excellent and would alone justify publication. That of *Philebus* is less close than Hackforth's to the style and run of the Greek but is for that reason more crisp and lively. Sometimes Taylor's interpretation is distinctly preferable, as at 44 d 2 where *δυσχερόματα* is 'grounds for dissatisfaction' (Taylor) rather than 'dour characteristics' (Hackforth). They are

nearly always free from the little preciosities in which Taylor sometimes indulged; but there are some examples, such as 'when a youth is first imbibed with it' (p. 109, γευσάμενος), and 'fribble' (p. 226, ῥιθίβιος). At *Phileb.* 40 a 'anticipations' may be misleading as a mere variant for 'expectations' (39 e); at 51 d μέλος should be 'melody' rather than 'note'—the point is of some small importance for Plato's aesthetics; at *Epin.* 974 a 'to live his time over again' might imply far more than the mere πάλιν ἀναβιώναι; at 975 b the τροφή of barley and wheat does not mean 'the making of food' from them. Apart from some printers' pie on p. 232 I have noted scarcely any misprints.

Some of the additional notes by the editors offer improved renderings or brief necessary explanations. They have a good suggestion at *Phileb.* 15 b: to transpose ὁμῶς before ἀεί, for they agree with Taylor that there are three questions mentioned, though they reject his view that the second question comes from *Parm.* 142 b ff. (one is already two if it has being as well as unity), and find Socrates' second difficulty to lie in saying that a particular being can be called eternal and self-identical. At 30 e they share Taylor's 'dreadful suspicion' that Plato wrote γενούσσης. At 35 a they give a valuable clarification: πλήρωσις means 'the state of repletion' in 1 and 2, but 'the process of replenishment' in 7. Unfortunately not all of these notes are so helpful. There is one which alleges that *Phileb.* 67 b cannot be understood apart from Diotima's speech in *Symp.* But it is hard to see what light these passages shed on each other. In *Symp.* 207 a, d the ἔρως of the beasts testifies to the universal desire of mortality for immortality, but in *Phileb.* 67 b 5 the θηρίων ἔρωτες are tantamount to the assertion of a hedonism which is rejected. And meanwhile there is no help with the question what is to be done with λόγων, boldly translated 'speakers' by Taylor.

Taylor's introduction to *Phileb.* occupies some ninety pages and is very successful in making the main issues discussed real and vivid. In detail it suffers by comparison with the thoroughness and scrupulousness of Hackforth's commentary. At times it may seem uncritical or complacent or give the impression that Taylor was over-anxious to forestall criticism of Plato by palliating difficulties of whose reality he was well aware. The notion of 'false pleasures' is not made easier by saying that such pleasures, or one class of them, lack 'ontological truth', 'are not true to type'; this simply translates into grandiloquent language the statement that some such pleasures sometimes appear greater than they are (42 b, c). Nor is it clear why the difficult grading of human possessions in 66 a-d should be said to represent 'a wider cosmic scheme'. I regard such glosses as on a par with saying (*Plato: the Man and his Work*, p. 501) that dialectic reappears in *Epin.* 'as the foundation of statesmanship' without calling attention (as Lloyd rightly does in this volume) to the curiously brief and incidental mention of dialectic (in the old sense) in this dialogue and its apparent replacement by a science of number.

In the main the introduction to *Phileb.* is a recasting, with some expansion, of c. xvi of *Plato: the Man and his Work*, including the familiar illustrations from more modern thinkers. Some of the omissions might invite speculation; for example there is now no comment on the difficulty (64 b) of inserting 'truth' into a mixture where it must be already present. The general picture is of the Platonic Socrates 'moderating' a dispute between Eudoxus and Speusippus in the Academy towards the middle of the fourth century. For that purpose he 'presupposes' the doctrine of classification found in *Soph.*, and in his account of

the 'consciously designing' royal soul of 30 d anticipates the argument regarding 'the best soul' of *Laws* x. For in *Phileb.* and *Laws* 'the agency of a divine mind' is now essential, as it was not (we are told) in *Phaedo* and *Rep.*, and so there is 'a shift of emphasis from merely formal to final and efficient causality'. I doubt if this could be reconciled with what *Plato: the Man and his Work*, p. 203, had to say on the connexion in *Phaedo* between 'end' and 'formal cause'. At the same time 'Socrates' plants himself firmly in the fifth century by refusing to speak of a Pythagorean One—an old argument which cannot survive J. E. Raven's *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*, cc. ix, xii. None of this makes it any easier to see what precisely Taylor thought on the Socratic problem; did his view boil down in the end to the modest formula (p. 12) that Plato's Socrates was 'not a purely fictitious character'?

One innovation seems to me the reverse of an improvement: 23 c-31 a is now taken decisively as referring to 'the constituents of the actual'. That is to say, Limit and Unlimited are regarded as 'factors' into which all concrete being is analysed; they are even equated with the form and matter of Aristotle (p. 37). It seems clear that this passage (whatever may be true of the earlier passage, 16 c ff.) does not in fact treat Limit and Unlimited as 'factors' or 'constituents' (save when they are mixed, but they exist also unmixed), but as classes of existing entities, physical and not metaphysical. Now if Limit gives us the 'formal causes' mentioned by Taylor, it would clearly be the seat of the ideas; so Hackforth on a similar interpretation holds that the ideas are 'behind' τὸ νῆπας. (Unfortunately at this point Hackforth offers a disquisition on *Tim.* rather than an analysis of *Phileb.*) It is curious that Taylor later returns to his old view that the ideas, as formal causes, are irrelevant to the fourfold classification of *Phileb.* He even argues that since greater-less belongs to the Unlimited, the idea of μέγεθος of *Phaedo* would have to be assigned to that class, and that since living creatures are classed as Mixed the idea of life mentioned in *Phaedo* would belong to the Mixed—a verbal type of inference to which Taylor was frequently prone. The final two pages are also new, containing Taylor's adverse comments on the theory of some moderns that morality is not concerned with aiming at the good but merely with doing the right, the right being described for the purpose of this refutation as 'purely arbitrary commands'. Whether this defence of the 'finalist' quality of Greek ethics is relevant to *Phileb.* may well be doubted; 53 e, even on Taylor's interpretation, hardly makes it so. In any case there are more illuminating passages in Plato, not here cited, on the tension between heteronomy and autonomy in Greek ethical thought.

The introduction to *Epin.* has been provided by Lloyd, who gives a useful conspectus of the questions at issue and puts the reader 'on the track of the literature' relevant to this dialogue.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

XENOPHON'S MEMORABILIA

OLOF GIGON: *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien.* (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 7.) Pp. 208. Basel: Reinhardt, 1956. Paper, 15.60 Sw. fr.

In this book Professor Gigon continues his studies in the structure of the *Memorabilia* in accordance with the principles sketched out in his *Sokrates* in

1947, and applied in his *Kommentar* on the first book of the *Memorabilia* published in 1953. (See *C.R.*, lxi [1955], 63-64.) At the end of the present volume there is added an index of passages for the two volumes taken together. The analysis of Book ii is found to confirm the analysis of the first book. Briefly, the conclusion is as follows. Xenophon does not give us any picture of the historical Socrates, only anecdotes and conversations or alleged conversations divorced from any historical context. We want to know how far these represent recollections by Xenophon himself, how far they are free inventions, and how far they are the result of working over older texts. The conclusion reached is that with very few exceptions we have a series of excerpts from earlier writings. Style, and composition in the sense of the manner in which the excerpts are selected and put together, are the work of Xenophon, and so are certain very general ideas which appear as favourite doctrines in other works of Xenophon. But in the vast majority of cases, while the underlying original material cannot be reconstructed as such, we can be certain that Xenophon is simply rewriting material found by him in writers such as Aeschines, Antisthenes, and, to a certain extent, Aristippus. It follows that it is to Xenophon that we must turn in the first instance for information about the Socratics who did not come under the influence of Plato. The establishment of this general thesis is the whole aim of the present commentary.

The method employed is simple to the verge of monotony. It consists in the search for inconsistencies and breaks in the sequence of thought in the *Memorabilia* as we have it. Such are found to obtain at every stage in the work, and it is argued that they all point to the incorporation of materials originally used in very different settings and for very different intellectual and artistic purposes, as, for example, an extract or extracts from a dialogue, it might be of Aeschines, rewritten and recombined to prove a point about Socrates quite different from that which they were originally intended to illustrate.

It must be said first of all that this is a most valuable exercise to pursue in the study of any author. In the case of a writer such as Plato it is indeed indispensable to pay the closest attention to the underlying sequence of thought lest his whole meaning be misunderstood. And there is no doubt that a perusal of Gigon's commentary cannot fail to deepen our understanding, if not our appreciation, of Xenophon as a writer. Much more doubtful, it seems to me, is the validity of the inferences which are made after analysis has revealed some great or slight imperfection in the orderly sequence of the argument. Order is perhaps always evidence of clear thought in the mind of a writer. But disorder can arise from many causes as we all know to our cost. It is very probable that Xenophon was neither a very profound nor a very clear thinker, and many discrepancies may be due simply to his own carelessness and inattention in developing his own thoughts, not the thoughts of others. Nor may we assume that when Xenophon is using the ideas and arguments of others he is necessarily taking them directly from written sources. Sometimes perhaps he is doing so, but often in such cases we should expect to find that he is speaking from memory, perhaps at a considerable interval after reading the work in question. In other cases he may well have acquired an anecdote in conversation, whether or not this anecdote already or later had been used by a writer of gossip or dialogues. Of course Gigon is aware of these possibilities, but at times he seems to allow too small a part to their operation.

Two examples must suffice. In ii. 1. 5 Gigon rightly points out that the

advice
it occurs
saying
Xenophon
tions,
else from
to Xenophon
probably
fact that
that it is
first to
in the
full di
Plato
mater
good.
have
Of co
innu
may l

Univers

ANNE
und
103.

To ju
into a
united
very
and h
of wh
fragm
—a la

So
analy
study
same
to be
dissin
like i
must
trans
but i
book

Th
analy

advice given is not really an example of the practice of *ἐγκράτεια* at all, though it occurs in a context concerned with this ideal. Similar advice is contained in a saying attributed to Antisthenes in Diog. Laert. vi. 4. Gigon concludes that Xenophon has introduced an alien piece of text without realizing its implications, and it is suggested that it comes either from a writing of Antisthenes or else from some writing about Antisthenes. But the story may well have come to Xenophon in conversation, and go back either to Socrates himself or more probably to the common stock of Athenian conversational wisdom. The fact that it does not fit its present context very well does not necessarily mean that it is taken from another piece of writing at all. Xenophon will not be the first to have introduced an irrelevant story because it appealed to him. Again, in the discussion of ii. 6 we have the same problem on a larger scale. After a full discussion of Plato's *Lysis* Gigon concludes that it is unlikely that either Plato or Xenophon is using the work of the other—rather both had the same materials before them and they used them in quite different ways. So far so good. But it seems to be assumed without discussion that this material must have been written material in the lost literature of the Eleatics and Socratics. Of course it may have been. But both Plato and Xenophon must have *heard* innumerable discussions in which Friendship figures as a major topic, and there may be no more in it than that.

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFERD

PHILODEMUS *DE MUSICA*

ANNEMARIE JEANETTE NEUBECKER: *Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stoikern und Epikureern*. Eine Analyse von Philodems Schrift *De musica*. Pp. 103. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 11.

To judge from recent publications there is no dearth of contemporary research into aspects of Greek music or Epicurean philosophy, and these themes are united in this book in the person of Philodemus. The *De Musica* has attracted very little study in English, and apart from van Krevelen's Dutch translation and brief commentary (1939), elucidation of this intricate text, the obscurities of which are enhanced—though one suspects not entirely caused—by its fragmentary nature, has been left for the most part to the interested individual—a laborious and often frustrating experience, as the reviewer can confirm.

Some of these difficulties at least are now removed by Dr. Neubecker's analysis in this volume, which is a successor to Otto Luschnat's preliminary study of the textual history and problems of the *De Musica* published in the same series in 1953. The 'edition' then announced turns out in the meantime to be a running commentary, with occasional discussion of textual matters, not dissimilar in layout to Schäfer's commentary on Aristides Quintilianus, and like it presupposes constant reference to some other text, so that the reader must have that of either Kemke or van Krevelen at his disposal. A complete translation of the fourth book at least would have been a welcome addition, but it seems from Neubecker's introductory remarks that even this present book is but a 'Vorläufer' of a complete commentary.

The larger of the two parts of the work contains an 'interpretation and analysis' of the first and fourth books, which afford the most continuous text, and

Dr. Neubecker is nothing if not painstaking in coping with the many difficulties and inconveniences of the cross-references in Philodemus' loosely constructed discourse; but the reader too must be prepared for a similar effort of concentration, although a series of summaries at the end of each portion of the analysis serves to give some degree of continuity, while a briefer conspectus at the end of the book arranges in parallel columns the probable order of subjects treated by Diogenes of Babylon (the object of most of Philodemus' polemic), and answered in turn by the Epicurean.

It may be thought paradoxical that the chief interest of the *De Musica* lies not so much in Philodemus' arguments *against* the classical 'ethos doctrine' of music as in the extraction of the original doctrines which he sets out to refute, and which by good fortune he usually quotes at some length before replying to them. Since Kemke's edition (1884) it has been generally appreciated that the most substantial work which came under fire was a book on music by the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon, and von Arnim in *S.V.F.* iii grouped many quotations from Philodemus among the fragments of that philosopher. Dr. Neubecker here attempts a fuller reconstruction of the substance of Diogenes' book from an examination of the themes disputed by Philodemus. Many of these are familiar enough from the better-known musical philosophers both before and after Diogenes, but it is of great interest in the history of this controversial subject to discover what original contributions were made by the Stoics to the classical statement of the doctrine established by Aristoxenus and the Peripatetics, after its adumbration by Damon and his followers and transformation by Plato. One feels, however, in Dr. Neubecker's appraisal of his contribution that the loss of works on the subject belonging to the intervening two centuries, particularly the general (i.e. non-technical) works on music of Aristoxenus, has resulted in the attribution of more originality to Diogenes than he strictly deserves, and that what appears new in his version of the ethos doctrine was in fact second-hand even to him. Nevertheless his attempts, for example, to defend in some degree 'erotic' and 'sympotic' forms of melody according to Stoic principles demonstrate that severer castigations of more popular types of music had been relaxed (Aristotle's criticisms of Plato already pointed the way). In this respect later Platonizing philosophers like Aristides and the compiler of the *De Musica* attributed to Plutarch again restricted their outlook to an uncompromising defence of the older doctrine.

The remainder of Dr. Neubecker's book contains a rather sketchy résumé of the history of the ethos doctrine and the attitude adopted towards it by representatives of the Stoic and Epicurean schools. This necessarily covers some of the same ground as the recent publications of Koller (on *Mimesis*) and Lasserre (on musical education, in the introduction to his edition of [Plutarch] *De Musica*), and it is unfortunate that they were not available until her work was already completed. She was able to add an appendix on the former book and to add certain qualifications in notes throughout the text, but Lasserre's edition, and (for example) his uncompromising views on the problem of Damon's importance for the subject, are not mentioned except curiously in a reference to Düring's review in *Gnomon*. The later polemic of Sextus Empiricus *Adversus Musicos*, which in many details forms so close a parallel to Philodemus' method of argument, might have been given more scope here also.

Dr. Neubecker concludes her essay with a further appreciation of the importance of the musical writings of Diogenes and Philodemus; and as some of this

become
ment of
study o
University

Athén
A. M.
207 (1
PROFES
than s
his wor
tells us
manus
ignore
one th
polvre
42 c μ
bracki
'seule
legenc
ἀρέπα
'je gap
The
3 d N
about
type;
the d
Intro
neede
Wh
fragm
Antip

where
Mein
genui
mally

Desro

becomes repetitive, one feels a little impatient of the rather ponderous arrangement of her material. Nevertheless it is useful to have so earnest and detailed a study of this difficult text.

University of Edinburgh

E. K. BORTHWICK

THE BUDÉ ATHENAEUS

Athénée: *Les Deipnosophistes*, livres i et ii. Texte établi et traduit par A. M. DESROUSSEAUX avec le concours de Charles Astruc. Pp. lxvii+207 (1-178 double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 1,200 fr.

PROFESSOR DESROUSSEAUX has been a keen student of Athenaeus for more than sixty years, and his enthusiasm remains undimmed. No one could call his work dull or conventional. Much of it, moreover, is sound. His introduction tells us what we need to know of Athenaeus himself, his dramatis personae, the manuscripts, and (apart from the fact that Gulick's work for Loeb is either ignored or unknown) the editions. As for the translation it is a pleasure to read one that has so few faults, and these mostly minor ones. For example, 17 b πολυτελείς must mean 'extravagant' and refer only to the suitors' servants; 42 c μόνον δ' ἀτέραμνον τῶν ἀλυκῶν τὸ τῆς Ἀρεθοῦσης should mean 'the only brackish water that is hard is that of Arethusa': Desrousseau translates 'seule est inaltérable aux éléments salins' and finds here a reference to the legend, but in so doing gives an unusual meaning and construction to ἀτέραμνον: I am tempted to suggest ἀκέραστον; 54 c ἐκοττάβιζον is certainly not 'je gagnais au cottabe', but (I suspect) 'I vomited'.

The notes are short, but adequate, and here again there is little to criticize. 3 d Nestor's advice was given to Agamemnon, not to Achilles; 6 a the remark about the dithyramb is obscure: at best it can be applied only to the later type; 18 b at least one French scholar would disagree with the implication that the division of the *Iliad* into 24 books is comparatively late (see Mazon, *Introduction à l'Iliade*, pp. 139-40); 40 b a note on τραγωδία and τρυγωδία is needed, with a reference to Pickard-Cambridge.

When we come to the text, our misgivings begin to mount. The verse fragments receive particularly rough treatment. The new look given in 4 f to Antiphanes (fr. 229 Kock) is extremely embarrassing:

οὔτοι δ' αἰ τὰ δείπνα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει
ἀφορώσι <καλὰ>, κτλ.,

where καλὰ is misplaced ('aux bons repas') and scanned as in epic. Why not Meineke's οὔτοι δὲ πρὸς . . . ἀφορώσιν αἰ? A brilliant piece of misplaced ingenuity occurs in 11 d-e, where the fragment of Aeschylus' *Palamedes* is normally (after Porson):

καὶ ταξιάρχας χάκατοντάρχας στρατῶ
ἔταξα. σίτον δ' εἰδέναι διώρισα
ἀριστα, δείπνα, δόρυ δ' αἰρεῖσθαι τρίτα.

Desrousseau, taking too seriously Kaibel's objection to εἰδέναι, reads:

<ΠΑΛ> καὶ ταξιάρχας χάκατοντάρχας στρατῶ
ἔταξα.

—σίτον δεῖ δέ.

—<ΠΑΛ> ναί, διώρισα, κτλ.

Comedy has indeed impinged upon Tragedy. Sometimes one suspects that Desrousseaux differs in order to be different. Why should we read <σύ> for <τοῦ> in 8 a, μηδὲ for μηδένα in 31 a, ὕμνον Αἰδου (which ruins the shape of the sentence and cannot mean 'hymne funéraire') for ὕμνος Αἰδου in 44 d, παρεῖναι for γὰρ εἶναι in 56 c, or φασι for φησι in 61 f? In 69 c (Amphis fr. 20 Kock) I cannot translate ἡ δὲ ἐν (οὐδὲ ἐν Meineke), while πτυχὴν for τύχη abolishes the double entendre in τρίβων.

More frequently, however, the idiosyncrasies are due to an excessive feeling of tenderness towards the manuscripts. Haplography is the venial offence that is all too often imputed to them, for example in 28 b ἔχει <παρέχειν>; 40 c ὁ γὰρ <δόσει> δεδωκώς (the Greek for which is δωρεάν δεδωκώς, but may we not read <θεός> with Hermann?); 45 f συμποσίους <ιοῖς>, an epic word and unnecessary; and 49 f ἐόρακας <ἀσκῶ> πώποτ', where ἦνυτρον means the same thing and Dobree conjectured ἦδη. Σῶσος the cook (11 c) is a long-lost child of Haplographia, and other textual creations are *Hylis the ball-player (15 a) and Μαίρα the hetaira (63 c-f).

It is Desrousseaux's obstinate fidelity to his readings from the manuscripts (readings which differ from those of Lobel and Page) that prompts him to begin the fragment of Sappho in 21 c (Bergk 70, Lobel and Page 57) with τίς δ', ἀγροῖωτι, . . . But we must keep τίς δ' ἀγροῖωτις . . . ; Andromeda, as Page explains (*Sappho and Alcaeus*, p. 133), is 'being captivated by some rustic wench' who has not learnt how to wear her clothes properly. Andromeda is not herself ἀγροῖωτις.

We have already seen instances of doubtful constructions, and there are others; for example in 12 f Desrousseaux should not have restored πλείον δέπας from Homer, because the quotation is part of a sentence which requires a dative, as the manuscripts indicate; 24 f ἀλλὰ μὴν καίτοι is a monstrosity, and Kaibel's ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοῖς a simple correction; 28 e it was not very wise to justify the retention of ὁ γὰρ λαβὼν by taking ὁ as equivalent to 'iste'; 51 e is probably an incurable passage, but it is quite clear that καθάπερ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ cannot be made to mean 'comme s'il était aspergé de sel'; 62 f σχολάζεται (Sophocles, *Ichneutae*) is an unusual passive form, but neither the construction nor the sense is improved by altering βλάστη in βλάστη.

Another fault is the admission of unsuitable words. In 20 c the substitution of the epic ἀριθμουμένας for ἀριθμουμένης is most unlikely: in any case the repetition of ἀριθμ- in this passage is deliberate; 26 f ἀγανώς, rare and poetical, occurs in a prose passage; 28 f προστάς τήθη from πρὸς τὰ στήθη is a delightful conjuring-trick, but no one except perhaps Homer would have used such a word for oysters; 36 c ὅστε—in Attic comedy! What is wrong with ὥστε? 56 d λιπαρείτω με (Teleclides fr. 38 Kock) is cunningly transformed into λιπαρεῖ τόμῳ: but 'a fat slice' of what? In any case, it should be λιπαρῶ; 58 f ἐμμενεῖς is poetical and mostly epic: perhaps we should read ἐν <τῷ> γένει (ἐν μέρει MSS).

Desrousseaux's non-conformist attitude also causes him to favour readings that must be and have been emended: 5 b ἐγὼ δ'; 14 d τὴν αὐτῶν βουλὴν; 22 f ἐκλυτον; 40 c οὐ μεθύω; 47 e κατὰ γῆς ἀναγκοισιῶ; 52 b καπυροτρογῆν. Elsewhere, Harrison's reviews of Gulick's edition in *C.R.* would have given him valuable help. Desrousseaux, however, offers good emendations in 23 c, 26 c, and 36 d: best of all is πόλον for ὄλον in 59 f.

This tedious enumeration calls for an apology. There are indications (p. liii,

note 1
stage i
Howe
tainly
than a
have d
will b
even i
by the
gotten
Univers

ERNST
sammi
12 pl
It is h
The F
work
forme
provin
judge
a noto
surfac
plaste
trium
Siegma
not So
might
attrib
with
story.
widely
185 to
meagre
Such
migrat
as we
habits
has m
contin
a forti
reliab
the te
phon
Th
twelv

note 1) that Desrousseaux wishes his work to mark a new and important stage in the history of the text of Athenaeus. This is a laudable ambition. However, one wonders if such a spectacular advance is possible: it can certainly not be achieved if one's predecessors are to be treated as rivals rather than as collaborators. So far as this first volume is concerned, the editor could have done more for the text by attempting less. Perhaps in later volumes there will be room for second thoughts and a somewhat different approach. But even if those who study the text can expect only to be amused or exasperated by the surprises that await them, casual readers, whom the editor has not forgotten, will be pleased and interested.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

HEIDELBERG PAPYRI

ERNST SIEGMANN: *Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrus-sammlung*. (Veröff. aus d. Heid. Papyrussammlung, Nr. 2.) Pp. vii+98; 12 plates in envelope. Heidelberg: Winter, 1956. Paper, DM. 40.

It is heartening to find papyrus texts once more being published in Germany. The *Hamburg Papyri* is followed within a year by the present volume in which work is resumed on a notable collection. Dr. E. Siegmann had a hand in the former book; the present one is entirely his work. In it he takes as his main province early Ptolemaic papyri. Texts like these, principally cartonage (I judge from the half-tone photographs, for the author does not say so), present a notoriously difficult paleographical problem. Usually limited in extent, their surface is often rubbed and frayed, the writing covered by a coat of irremovable plaster, and the whole smeared with casual offsets of ink. It is sometimes a triumph to identify even the literary genre to which a fragment belongs, as Siegmann appears to have done with 190 (formerly = P. Heid. 176—*Scoptica*, not Sotadean verses, as Diehl held. As parallel to the literary genre the author might have added the more or less contemporary *ἐπιστολιμαῖοι χαρακτήρες* attributed to Demetrius). Sometimes an almost divinatory decipherment (as with 206) hits the mark; a fragment can be identified and made to tell its story. More often luck is out, and publication transmits the challenge more widely. Even when a plausible solution is suggested, as with the attribution of 185 to the opening of *Prometheus Unbound*, it might be thought that in view of the meagre compass of the text knowledge was not much advanced.

Such a judgement would be false and hasty. It is worth knowing that immigrants like Theocritus' Aeschines relished Aeschylus and Greek philosophy as well as Menander, Euripides, and Homer, and the evidence for the reading habits and literary tastes of such as he, provided by patient work of this kind, has more than doubled in the last five years. More important, that evidence continues to support the view that your Greek of the third century B.C. (and *a fortiori* of the fourth and fifth?) cared little whether he had a depraved or a reliable text of his author. Siegmann rightly spends a considerable space on the textual aspect of an early scrap of Euripides' *Heracles* (205) and of Xenophon's *Memorabilia* (206).

Thirty papyri are dealt with in this volume, eighteen of them of Ptolemaic, twelve of Roman date. Four have been published before, and are treated again

here (three of them with *new* numbers!) because the editor has either a new fragment or a new reading; in the case only of No. 190, however, does he discuss their contents, and with No. 184 (= old No. 180) he restricts himself to giving a new text. Nine of the thirty consist of authors already known; there are seven of the Roman period, and the authors are Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Isocrates, and (most unusual) Plutarch (*Pelopidas*). The most tantalizing pieces of the new literature are 181, iambic trimeters in Doric (Epicharmus?), and 183, the ending of Posidippus' *Ἀποκλειομένη*, vouched by title. Of the eighteen Ptolemaic texts one belongs to the Zenon Archive; twelve are known to come from El Hibeh, and it is probable that the remaining five are of the same provenance. For these seventeen it may be inferred that datings 'about 200 B.C.' (which often rest on comparison with undated texts) are too low, and that 'about 250 B.C.' would be nearer to the mark. Early and middle third century is the preponderant period of those documents in the Hibeh collection which carry a date, and the latest known is of 204/3 B.C. In any case, writing of the second half of the third century has a distinctive appearance, not often found in these texts. It may further be asked whether two of these texts are not 'documents' rather than literature. No. 195 (from Oxyrhynchus) is full of documentary vocabulary (e.g. i. 1, *ἐνεχυ*]ρασιῶν ἐκτιθέν[τες]; ii. 8, read *εὐδοκοῦσι*; for *τὰ φημιζόμενα* in a papyrus letter cf. P. Giss. 19. 4. The text should be dated first century B.C., not second century A.D.), and probably it is part of a Ptolemaic official letter or report. No. 199, 'Metrologische Schrift' is perhaps no more than the metrological memoranda (l. 12 perhaps *ἐάν σοι φαίνεται*) of a certain Leontiscus, who may be that one who occupied a *κλήρος* in the Oxyrhynchite nome in 258/7 B.C. (*B.G.U.* 1228. 8), the probable time and provenance of our text.

I add notes on a few details. No. 187: the use of the second person, the vocative of address, and above all the heading *ἄλλο* suggest that the anthology is of epigrams. We know that trimeters were used for them in third-century Alexandria (cf. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri*, no. 109). No. 189: something has gone wrong with the copy or the proof. I read clearly l. 11 *]πενθερον*, l. 12 *]..Ελικωνιον*. In l. 10 perhaps *μελαγκρη[πις*? No. 193: ii. 7 *τομ πλησιον* is unquestionably the reading. In 202 provenance should read *Batn-el-Harit*.

Dr. Siegmann is to be congratulated on his successful exploitation of these at first sight repellent scraps.

University College, London

E. G. TURNER

CICERO'S *DE NATURA DEORUM*

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE: *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum liber primus*. Pp. viii+537. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Cloth, 120s. net.

'THE admirable work of Cicero *de Natura Deorum*', wrote Gibbon, 'is the best clue we have to guide us through the dark and profound abyss' of ancient theological speculation. While the historical criticism of the nineteenth century detracted somewhat from its authority, its interest was enhanced by an increased knowledge of Hellenistic philosophy, and in England the elaborate commentary of J. B. Mayor did justice to its importance as a document in the

history of ancient thought. Professor Pease has now celebrated the bimillenary of the work by an edition on an even fuller scale than that of Mayor. The first volume includes the text of Book i with commentary, and an introduction of about 100 pages to the work as a whole; the second volume, containing text and commentary on Books ii and iii, is expected to appear shortly.

Professor Pease, as those who know his editions of *De Divinatione* and *Aeneid* iv will be aware, is nothing if not thorough. He annotates everything. His commentary begins with three notes, extending to four columns in all, on the title, one on *De Natura Deorum* (whether this or *De Deorum Natura* is the correct form), the second on *De* and the third on *Natura Deorum*, and similar methods are followed throughout. The notes are long and sometimes take one far afield, to atheism in Ethiopia (note on Protagoras), to monkeys worshipping the new moon (note on Catulus' epigram on Roscius), or to villages in England noted for the stupidity of their inhabitants (note on *patria Democriti*). Every point is illustrated by copious quotations and references. For many of these the reader will be grateful—the full quotations from Philodemus are particularly welcome; but he will also feel that a good deal of the material could have been omitted without much loss. It seems hardly necessary to give twenty-four references in support of the fact that Xenophanes came from Colophon (which Cicero does not mention), or nearly 200 to illustrate the phrase *oculis animi* in § 21, especially when the editor brackets *animi* in the text. Some of the material included is of doubtful relevance and hardly helpful; one could, for example, dispense with the last sentence of the note on *perturbatio vitae* in § 3 (*Perturbatio* is considered by G. Kilb, *Ethische Grundbegriffe der alten Stoa*, u.s.w. (1939)—known to me only from a review in *Cl. Weekly*, 34 (1941), 160—as a translation of *πάθος*). A noteworthy feature of the commentary is the very full citation from the writers of later antiquity, including the Christian Fathers. Where these writers merely repeat familiar information there is little to be gained by piling up such references, but often it is of real interest to be able to follow some idea through the whole of antiquity into the Christian period.

In passages where the text or interpretation is uncertain Pease conscientiously assembles the views of previous scholars, including some which could perhaps have been left in obscurity, and puts forward his own views cautiously and hesitantly. His conservatism sometimes leads him to defend what seems hardly defensible, as in § 39, where he retains the manuscript reading *fatalem umbram*, translating 'wraith of destiny'. Nor is he likely to carry conviction when in § 1 he reads *de qua tam variae sunt . . . sententiae magno argumento esse debeat*, where most editors either keep the manuscript reading *sint* and add *cum* before *tam* or insert *ut* before *magno*. Here his remark that the addition of *cum* 'might soften the omission of *ut* before *magno argumento*' is curious, for if *cum . . . sint* is right, *ut* is quite unwanted. In § 81, where he reads *quod si* rather than the *quid si* of the *deteriores* which most editors prefer, the passages which he quotes in support are not really parallel, and more instances could have been added to the one he gives of *quid si* followed by *tamenne*.

The introduction is characteristically thorough, but somewhat marred by excessive and uneconomical annotation, as on p. 23, where there are references to the same passage of Cicero in four consecutive notes. It is a pity too that Pease, who generally cites the ancient evidence with such completeness, should occasionally content himself with a reference to a modern work which may well not be accessible to the reader. For instance, in the valuable and informa-

tive section on 'subsequent influence' it is tantalizing to find Tertullian dismissed with a reference to an article in *Atene e Roma*. Sometimes the editor appears to have copied quotations from his notes without verifying their context. Thus Mayor's remark quoted on p. 9 was made not of *De Natura Deorum* as a whole but of Book ii, and that quoted at the end of note 4 on p. 27 applied only to the pre-Stoic part of the doxographic section. On p. 72 the statement that the Cambridge MS. was given to the library by Archbishop Rotherham 'nearly four centuries ago' can hardly be right, since Rotherham died in 1500. The editor appears to have derived his information from J. S. Reid and to have forgotten that over seventy years have passed since he wrote.

It was only to be expected that where such a vast mass of quotations and references were involved some errors should creep in. Without making any attempt at systematic checking I have observed the following:

- p. 5, n. 5. For 1886 read 1885.
- p. 6, n. 3. For *Fam.* read *Att.*
- p. 23, n. 5. For *distutationes* read *disputationes*.
- n. 8. For *Q. Fr.* 3, 5, 1 read *Q. Fr.* 3, 5, 2.
- The references in the text on this page should be renumbered; the second ¹ should be ², and so on.
- p. 34, n. 3. Insert *a Cotta* after *istuc* and *deos* after *disserendi*.
- p. 35, n. 8. Insert *ἐκεῖνο* after *σκοπήσωμεν*. Read *μὲν* for *μεὶ* and *καὶ* for *καὶ*.
- p. 54. In the quotation from Arnobius insert *Romani* after *Tullius* and for *qui* read *quid*.
- p. 64, second line of last paragraph. For *lxxi* read *lxx*.
- p. 88, n. 4. The third edition of Harwood's *View of the Various Editions* was published in 1782, not in 1790 (the date of the fourth edition).
- pp. 96 and 103. For Thoul*ié* read Thoul*ier*.
- p. 99. Under '1820 London' for 204 read 294.
- p. 100. Insert the date of Henry Allen's edition (1836).
- p. 113, col. 2 (Sext. Emp. *Pyrrhon.* 3, 30). For *aeraí* read *adraí*.
- p. 152, col. 1 (*Off.* 2, 8). For *ipsius* read *ipsum*.
- p. 153, col. 2 (Lact. *Inst.* 3, 4, 11). For *reprehensus* read *reprehensiones*.
- p. 156, col. 2 (*Ac.* 2, 103). For *Academicos* read *Academicis*.
- p. 158, note on *inlustrem*. For *cohibeo* read *cohibes*.
- p. 186, col. 1 (Philo, *De Aetern. Mundi*, 17). For *Νέγεσθαι* read *λέγεσθαι*.
- p. 187, col. 2 (Aug. *Conf.* 11, 12). Insert *quam numquam ante condiderat* after *conderet*.
- p. 229, col. 1 (Sext. Emp. *Adv. Phys.* 1, 19). For *ἀγαθοποιὰ* read *ἀγαθοποιά*.
- p. 281, col. 1 (Xenophanes fr. 11). For *θειοῖσ'* read *θεοῖσ'*.
- col. 2 (Plat. *Rep.* 2, 377 e-378 d). For *ὄρε* read *ὁ τε*.
- p. 293, col. 2 (*N.D.* 2, 147). Insert *rationem* after *hominis*.
- p. 311, col. 1 (Liv. 21, 62, 5). For *species* read *specie*.
- p. 361, col. 2 (*Fin.* 1, 20). For *declinabuntur* read *declinabunt*; insert *atomis* after *provincias*; for *potuit* read *poterit*.
- p. 372, note on *turpius est*. For *clinaman* read *clinamen*.
- p. 391, col. 1 (Plin. *N.H.* 35, 91-92). For *principato* read *principatu*.
- p. 398, col. 2 (Epicharmus fr.). For *οὐδὲ* read *οὐδὲν*.
- p. 412, col. 1 (*Fin.* 3, 17). For *intellegantur* read *intelliguntur*.
- p. 441, col. 2 (Plato, *Rep.* 6, 501 b). For *ὁ* read *ὁ δ*.

p. 478, col. 1 (*N.D.* 2, 42). For *aera* read *aere*.

p. 496, col. 1 (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1, 7). Insert $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\varsigma$ before $\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$.

p. 513, col. 1 (*N.D.* 1, 77). For *et* read *ut*.

This volume leaves one with mixed feelings. It is hardly the sort of book one would recommend to a young student reading *De Natura Deorum* for the first time, and even hardened professional scholars may, when they use it, find it hard to resist a certain feeling of weariness. Yet one must acknowledge with respect and gratitude the tireless and methodical industry which has been devoted to the accumulation of this mass of illustrative matter and the care which has been expended on presenting it in an orderly manner, on choosing the appropriate passages for quotation, and on giving exact references. This is a work to which scholars can turn in the knowledge that all the material is there. It is more than an edition of one of Cicero's works; it is a kind of encyclopaedia of ancient religion and theology, with articles on many other subjects too, including cats and crocodiles, apes and winged serpents. It is safe to say that 'Pease on *N.D.*' will be often referred to in the future.

University College, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

PERSIUS EDITED AND EXPLAINED

NINO SCIVOLETTO: Auli Persi Flacci Saturae. Testo critico e commento. Pp. xviii+178. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 1,700.

ENZO V. MARMORALE: *Persio*. 2a edizione rifatta. Pp. viii+353. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 2,000.

SCIVOLETTO bases his text of Persius on the three chief manuscripts, PAB; towards the others, particularly those of the 'mixed' tradition, he manifests a cautious scepticism: 'se abbiamo riportato nell'apparato critico lezioni dei codici più noti della recensione contaminata, l'abbiamo fatto per dimostrare come essi si appoggino a una delle due più autorevoli e non costituiscano quindi un sussidio fondamentale per la costituzione del testo' (p. xv). Accordingly he accepts the readings of the *recentiores* at a few places only, mostly where PAB have obviously blundered; he follows the ancient Bobbio fragment at a few others (unwisely at i. 66 *dirigat* for *derigat*). After reviewing the two branches, or as he calls them in deference to the fashion 'recensions', of the PAB tradition (P, α = AB) and their treatment by previous editors, he comes to the sensible conclusion that it is impossible to predicate superiority of either: 'invece sembra più logico . . . pensare a una recensione aperta, per cui la vera lezione si determina solo con il *iudicium*' (p. xi). In spite of this statement he seems to favour α somewhat at the expense of P, in which he detects 'una tendenza a nobilitare per così dire le lezioni, a renderle più dotte, a mostrare una certa cultura' (p. x). This cultivated interpolator is illusory; at least the evidence adduced for his activity will not do: *primordia rerum* for *p. vocum* (vi. 3) is a common type of aberration, well within the powers of comparatively unlearned scribes, and *audiat* for *audiet*, *poscas* for *poscis*, *progenien* for *progenies* and particularly *quam* for *qua* and *optent*, *servans*, *pallens* for *-et*, *-as*, *-es* can be paralleled in many manuscripts. This error must be the cause of the enigmatic note at iii. 9 on P's *oridas* for *credas*.

After the good sense which nevertheless is the characteristic feature of the short introduction (eleven pages, concerned only with textual matters) the text itself is a disappointment. The following passages may serve to illustrate the editor's preferences and his judgement: (i) choice between P and a: (a) P preferred to a: i. 9 *tunc cum/tum cum* (cf. v. 37); 30 *pendes/pendas*; 34 *vanum et plorabile siquis/vatum et plorabile siquid* ('io intenderei l'emistichio come un inciso che fa da determinativo dei due nomi ("se qualcuno vuol ricordare cose insignificanti e lacrimevoli" oppure senz'altro "cose insignificanti e lacrimevoli"); 107 *verbo/vero* (the defence of *verbo* is tortuous and unconvincing; *utrum in alterum?*); v. 150 (see below); 159 *at/et*. (b) a preferred to P: i. 31 *quis narret/quid narrent* (no discussion); ii. 41 *poscit/poscis* ('*Poscit* è senza un sogg. determinato come già altrove', but no mention of *rogabit* immediately preceding and *exoptas* following); iii. 29 *censoremque tuum/-ve tuum*; 46 *et insano/non sano* (supported by Σ; there are several other passages where the scholiast's reading might well be mentioned and is not, despite the remarks on p. xiv; e.g. iv. 26, v. 19, 73); iv. 29 *veteris/veterem* (*utrum in alterum?*); v. 59 *fecerit/frigerit* (*frigerit* is *difficilior lectio*, is supported by *contudit* at Hor. Sat. ii. 7. 16, and is the more picturesque and unusual expression; and at the risk of becoming tedious I again ask—*utrum in alterum?*); 82 *haec/hoc*; 150 *sudore/suadare* = *sudare* (by combining *sudore* with P's *peragant* one gets the worst of both worlds; but there is no proper discussion and no parallels for the resultant phrase); vi. 23 *scombros/rombos* (the defence of *scombros* is ingenious, but the clauses introduced by *nec . . . nec* can hardly be opposed in sense, or what becomes of *ideo?*); 26 *metuis/metuas* (cf. 41). To these passages add the note at iv. 46 '*potes PA², potest a (fortasse rectius)*'. (ii) P^{aw} preferred to a minority: i. 17 *legens/leges* (no discussion of the construction of the sentence thus achieved); iii. 60 *dirigis/derigis* (cf. i. 66); v. 17 *dicis/dicas*; 35 *deducit/diducit* (the wording of the note as well as the parallel at iii. 56 would seem to commit the editor to *di-*).

The apparatus criticus could be improved by purging it of (i) such of the blunders of P^a (the majority) as are of no critical interest; (ii) notes such as those at i. 8, iii. 13, v. 109 in which the finger of scorn is pointed at conjectures which are not reported; (iii) the name of Kukula wherever it occurs and some other conjectures of little merit. On the other hand, the testimony of grammarians and the scholia should figure more often. Not all the conjectures (no conjecture, by the way, not even Madvig's *articulis*, is admitted to the text, unless one so counts *ex sitiente* at v. 136)¹ are correctly assigned: i. 8 the omission of *est* is not a conjecture, as would appear from the note; 13 *inclusus (numerus)* Markland; v. 90 *vetabit* Heinrich. At vi. 37 it would be reasonable to mention who proposed the rejected transposition.

The commentary which is printed beneath the text, though it contains much useful matter and some good notes, is a slovenly and undisciplined affair with many inaccuracies and superfluities. There is far too much Italian in it and too little Latin and Greek: most readers will not trouble to look up illustrative parallels which are not quoted in full (the vast majority here), and small blame to them. There are too many injunctions to admire, too much in the style of 'si osserva l'abilità de poeta', 'Quale conoscenza dell'animo umano!', 'È un magnifico quadro, questo . . .' (see the notes at, for example, iii. 47, 79, v. 179). The exposition is verbose. A short summary and analysis should precede

¹ That it is probably not a conjecture appears from Clausen's critical note; how Scivolto regards it is not entirely clear from his note.

each satire; the First is bewildering without a sketch of the historical and literary background, and Seneca's 114th Epistle should be discussed, not merely referred to in passing in the notes. This, the best of the Satires, is in fact served the worst: the editor obscures the connexion of thought by printing nonsense at l. 8, not seeing that l. 121 repeats the same question, and does not relate such passages as 1-12 or 69-75 to their context and the Satire as a whole. In the commentator's first duty, that of explaining difficulties, Scivoletto leaves something to be desired. He rarely gives a translation, the only satisfactory form of commentary on such a difficult author. Some examples of various forms of shortcoming: i. 11-12 *ignoscite*. 'nolo', etc. not explained; Housman's interpretation ought to be mentioned; 67-68 the editor gives the opinions of Jahn, Conington, Némethy, and van Wageningen, but not his own (as too often: e.g. iii. 29, v. 6, vi. 3); 92-106 the reader might reasonably expect the text of Nero's verses, not an off-hand reference to Marmorale (as too often: e.g. i. 121, iii. 37, iv. 1-22); ii. 55 *subiit* 'La desinenza -it è allungata davanti alla cesura'; iii. *init.* Housman's interpretation should be discussed here, not postponed until p. 70; 44 *saepe oculos, memini, tangebam* 'È un caso di paratassi' (cf. v. 27; one of the editor's King Charles's heads, this; others are the ethic dative and the 'lingua affetiva' (both together at v. 19) and adjectives in -osus); 52 *curvos* why not cite the obvious parallels in Persius himself? (cf. iii. 77-87, iv. 11, v. 14, 15, 25, 65); iv. 7 *fert animus* 'ti basta l'animo'; *ibid.* *silentia* 'il plurale del sostantivo sottolinea l'ironia delle parole, trasportandoci in una atmosfera di silenzio cosmico'; v. 73-74 a translation is absolutely necessary; 174 *exieras* 'si noti l'ind. invece de congiuntivo'; noted—but how is it to be translated?; 179-88 an excursus on the Jews at Rome would help here. In short, the elimination of blunders quite apart, much needs to be done before this commentary can achieve what should be its primary aim, that of aiding and enlightening the reader.

Miscellaneous points. The punctuation of the text seems to have gone astray at iii. 28-29, v. 51, 174, vi. 2; and I have doubts about v. 24, 27, 101, vi. 41, 73-74. At p. 3 read 'collegii Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis' not 'Sacrosanctae'. The only misprints of any consequence that I have noticed are those in the text at i. 79 (*hoc* for *hos*), v. 79 (*recuses* for *recusas*), and v. 172 (*accessor* for *accersor*). Finally, no edition of Persius can be considered complete without a text of the ancient Life.

The second edition of Marmorale's *Persio* is substantially the same as the first, published in 1941 but restricted in circulation by the war. It is curiously planned: the first hundred-odd pages are an appraisal of Persius as poet; the bulk of the book consists of two long appendixes 'Questioni Biografiche' and 'L'opera', to which most of the technical discussion is relegated. The author insists that Persius must be examined on his merits and without prejudice: 'deve essere compreso, per essere giudicato' (p. 101). He was first and foremost a poet, labelled 'satirist' and 'moralist' by posterity. The title of his work *saturae* is scouted; 'un nome non è la realtà' (p. 15) (but did the ancients, did Persius himself, think thus of literary genres?). It is not easy to appreciate him, and modern critics have not taken the necessary pains, though the ancients judged him justly (was the judgement of Quintilian and Martial infallible? It is surely going too far to argue *ex silentio*, as is done at p. 100, that his contemporaries did not find him obscure). There is a good deal in this case, but it is overstated and presented in a rhetorical and forensic style that at times comes

close to humbug: e.g. (on Persius' alleged inexperience of real life) 'come se ci fosse una vita reale fuori dell' individuo e che l'individuo non potesse intuire per il semplice fatto di essere uomo' (p. 59). The author treats matters of opinion in the positive tones of one who possesses a critical master-key (cf. the Introduction)—but discounting all this the first part of the book is profitable reading for those who think that they have made up their minds about Persius.

The appendixes are sober and careful, containing little that is startling and much that is instructive, in particular the sections on the sources of Persius' philosophy. There is some making of bricks without straw, such as is inevitable in literary history: the *positive* evidence for the attribution of i. 99–102 to Nero has always seemed thin to me and still seems thin. But the ingenious hypothesis (developed from the suggestion of an earlier writer) that the words of the *Life uersus aliqui dempti sunt ultimo libro* refer to the choliambic 'Prologue' deserves careful consideration.

The publishers deserve a word of commendation for the attractive dust-jacket, reproduced from the painting mentioned on p. 284, n. 1. A pity that it is not included as frontispiece.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

RECENTIORES NON DETERIORES

A. Persi Flacci, *Saturarum liber*. Edidit W. V. CLAUSEN. Pp. xxviii+43. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS correct and elegant edition marks a notable step forward in the criticism of Persius. Besides the three chief manuscripts PAB, the Bobbio fragment, and the St. Gall florilegium, the editor bases his text on Vat. Reg. 1560, a manuscript of some importance first brought into notice by himself, and on seven other manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries; he cites another fourteen intermittently and in an Appendix lists thirty-three others of lesser importance, most of which he has collated himself. He cites the ancient scholia according to his own recension, which is based on the three uninterpolated manuscripts singled out by Wessner. These facts speak for themselves, and amply justify the statement of the publishers that 'this edition provides the first critical text of Persius to be accompanied by an accurate report of the manuscript tradition on which it rests'.

To those who content themselves with counting the passages where this text differs significantly from its predecessors the gain from all this industry may appear relatively small. Such an approach would be superficial. This edition is an object-lesson, which one hopes will not be lost on editors, in the importance of surveying *the whole* of a tradition and assessing the 'best' manuscripts against the background of the rest. An example: Clausen's note on i. 31 makes it clear for the first time that the 'variant' *quis . . . narret* is peculiar to a (ignoring the appearance of *quis* in Vat. Palat. 1710, on which see the extremely interesting note at p. xiii: I cite this as a warning against the useless but common practice of publishing isolated studies of manuscripts of this order of importance), that it is an aberration, not a true variant at all. It may be said that no editor with a grain of sense or latinity would print it in any case; but the unhappy truth is that it *has* been printed, and this demonstration that it is as

destitute of authority as of sense lessens the chance of its ever being taken seriously again. Compare similarly P's nonsense at i. 34, and see, for example, ii. 15, iii. 26, v. 93, 150, vi. 46. The editor remarks in fact (p. xvi) that when the *recentiores* are taken into account 'it is not usually a case of preferring P or *a* in isolation' and points out that P alone preserves a true reading in only six places [of which v. 190 is only a matter of orthography], *a* once, Pa together twice.

Much accordingly turns on the worth of the *recentiores*, which editors have consistently despised. Clausen demonstrates in his short but meaty Preface that 'the secondary MSS. are simply less good than Pa, but not on that account contemptible or essentially different in character' (p. xvii), and he proceeds to discuss a number of passages in which they preserve a true reading that has been falsified in Pa (pp. xviii-xxi). He discounts the idea, and as I think rightly, that these readings are due to conjecture: even *leges* at i. 17, hitherto attested only in the *editio princeps* and a single manuscript of the fifteenth century, is shown to be postulated by the explanation of *Σ* (p. xxii, n. 1). Fragments of the truth, neither due to conjecture nor derived from Pa, but genuine tradition, may survive in the most unlikely places (p. xxi): the same picture that meets us in the transmission of Ovid, Lucan, and Juvenal. As to Pa, their relative merits are incidentally indicated in the tables at pp. xvii-xviii, though these are designed to show the differing allegiance of the *recentiores*: P is preferred to *a* in thirty-six places against eleven. The 'Sabinus' *subscriptio* is shown to have been in *a*, and Lindsay's theory is discounted (pp. ix-x); *a*, however, is not to be taken as representing a recension by Sabinus very closely (p. xxiii)—it is high time this was said. *Σ* has no particular connexion with Pa (p. xxiv).

The text itself, as I have already implied, offers comparatively few novelties; where Clausen differs from all or most of his predecessors it is usually for the better. I give a selection of noteworthy passages, for the most part without remark. i. 8 *nam Romae quis non—*a*, si fas dicere—sed fas . . .*, 11-12 *tunc tunc—ignoscite (nolo, | quid faciam?) sed sum petulanti splene—cachinno* (following Hermann's interpretation), 23 *articulis* (Madvig), ii. 47 *flamma (recc., Σ)*, v. 35 *diducit*, 66 *fiat* (following Housman), 73-74 *non hac, ut quisque Velina | Publius emeruit, scabiosum tesserula far | possidet* (following Conington), 90 *uetabit* (Heinrich), 134 *rogat!* (recc., *Σ*, Cartault), 136 *et (codd. pler., Cartault)*, vi. 51-52 *dic clare. 'non adeo', inquis, | 'exossatus ager iuxta est.'* (following Hermann and Housman). Only rarely do I quarrel with his choice: the only real failure of nerve seems to me his preference of *fecerit* to *fregerit* at v. 59 (cf. supra, p. 224); and at *Prol.* 9 I am slightly puzzled to know the intrinsic merits of *verba nostra*: authority is on the side of *nostra verba*, which must have stood in P, since P² has *v. n.*

The apparatus criticus is full. I do not wish to labour my own preference for a sparer apparatus, especially since this one is so excellent of its kind, but I question whether it is the right place for 'minute collations' (p. xxvii) of even the chief manuscripts, and speaking for myself I should be glad to see a good many 'variants' which are really nothing of the kind omitted in favour of more collections of palaeographical or linguistic parallels such as those at i. 111 (haplography of words: notice the correction *en passant* of *Culex* 266 *femineum concepta manet, manet et procul ille*), 131 (prepositions to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ: in restoring *Hybla* at Ovid, *A.A.* iii. 150 Clausen has stolen a little thunder of my own), v. 45-51 (*seu = vel si*), 64 (assonance), 136 (conjunctions joining non-coordinate phrases). These and other *obiter dicta* are all too rare. Most

readers, for instance, would be glad of guidance at iii. 29 *censoreme tuum vel quod trabeate salutas*, which Housman treated under the same rubric as v. 136.

The text of the ancient *Life* is included, as of course it should be, based on five principal manuscripts, with four others cited occasionally. Here too there are some changes for the better: notably the editor's correction of ll. 36-38 *scriptis tantum ad matrem codicillis Cornuto rogavit ut daret HS XX* [Clausen], *aut ut quidam*, C [Casaubon, Gronovius, Lond. Mus. Brit. Reg. 15 B XIX]; i.e. *sestertia viginti* and *centum*, not *sestertium vicies* and *centies*. His correction of 23-24 *quae illius essent vera esse poemata, se ludos facere* [se l. f. Villeneuve], though it cannot be called certain, excels earlier conjectures in its nearness to the order of words in the manuscripts. Notice also 19 *aeque tum*, 27 *Agathini* (Osann), 44 *contraxit*. (At 3 why is *Afinio* not ascribed?)

This edition shows what may be done for a Latin poet by a combination, unhappily not as common as it might be, of diligence, accuracy, and what Horace Walpole called 'the most desirable kind of understanding . . . the only kind that never aims at any particularity; I mean common sense'. By modern standards this is the first adequate critical edition of this author that has ever been seen, and its appearance provides the student of Persius with his only sure foundation, a sound text soundly based. I notice that Clausen intends to publish a critical edition of the ancient scholia, the *Commentum Cornuti*. Will he, after he has performed this admittedly useful task, consider giving us a commentary on Persius? It would be instructive to see his opinions, for instance, on Nero's alleged verses or on the unity of the choliambics, taken here as Prologue and printed without allusion to the misgivings which they have from time to time aroused.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

A NEW TRANSLATION OF TACITUS' ANNALS

MICHAEL GRANT: *Tacitus on Imperial Rome*. (Penguin Classics.) Pp. 447; 9 maps. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 5s. net.

THIS is a welcome addition to the Penguin series of English translations of the Classics for the general reader. Professor Grant has given a useful introduction on Roman historiography in general and Tacitus in particular, indicating the difficulties caused to the translator by Tacitus' peculiar style, and concluding that the only hope of rendering his rhetorical artistry 'lies in as trenchant and stringent a simplicity as the translator can achieve'. The text is followed by fourteen pages of short notes, a list of Roman emperors and eastern kings, a key to technical terms and to place-names, nine maps of provinces and parts of the Empire, including a plan of Rome, genealogical tables of the imperial families, and an index of personal names. There is no map showing the full extent of the Empire in the time of Trajan, in which a general reader might have been interested.

What policy the translator of an ancient author should adopt in order to be faithful to his original, to what extent the style of the Latin or Greek should influence the English style attempted, are questions which will be disputed to the end of time. On one point only there is some measure of agreement. As Grant says on p. 23, the English should try 'to convey, as faithfully as possible,

the essential thought and significance of what Tacitus wrote'. But ancient historians did not regard themselves as writers of technical treatises; they were literary artists, and the substance and form of what they wrote are so intimately connected that they cannot be separated without sacrificing the most valuable lesson that antiquity can teach. It is therefore wrong to assume, as many do, that, in order to make a similar impression on the English reader to that which the ancient author is conceived to have made on his contemporaries, Latin must be rendered into the amorphous colloquial vernacular to which English readers are now accustomed. Grant has not made that mistake. But it would require the pen of a Gibbon to reproduce in English anything like the rhetorical artistry, the epigram, and the blighting insinuations of Tacitus. Grant therefore attempts a compromise. Accepting the usual assumption that the twentieth-century reader finds an elaborate style unreadable, he has tried to reproduce Tacitus' conciseness and point by writing short sentences and breaking up the longer periods which demand an intellectual effort from the reader.

He has produced something very readable, but in his desire to modernize he goes rather too far. Why should the differences between Roman civilization and ours be deliberately hidden? Is it really necessary to translate *legio* and *centurio* by 'brigade' and 'company-commander', and *equites* by 'gentlemen outside the senate'? These English equivalents are explained in the Key to Technical Terms. It should have been the other way round.

In spite of the generally high level there are occasional lapses into colloquialism. For example, Tacitus would be shocked if he knew he had been represented as writing the Latin equivalent of 'bribes . . . if you want to avoid chores' (. . . *vacationes munerum redimi*), or 'the rest was up to them' (*cetera ipsi exsequerentur*), or 'Augustus wanted to have another iron in the fire' (*quo pluribus munimentis insisteret*—with reference to his dynastic plans).

But far more reprehensible are the too frequent failures 'to convey the essential thought and significance of what Tacitus wrote'. The following is a selection: i. 7, *inrepsisse* is ignored. i. 8 . . . *plerosque invisos sibi, sed iactantia gloriaque ad posteros*, 'Augustus had detested a good many of them, but insured their names as a pretentious claim for posthumous applause'. If this is trenchant and astringent, it is not simple. There is no attempt at interpretation. Tacitus means that Augustus was trying to display the extent of his patronage and give posterity the impression that his régime won wider acceptance from the aristocracy than it did. i. 29, *stabat Drusus silentium manu poscens*, 'Drusus mounted it (the dais) and made a gesture calling for silence'. The imperfect tense does not make a statement of completed action. Tacitus' graphic picture is ruined. Tense-aspect is again neglected at i. 62 *igitur . . . condebat*, where the effect of Tacitus' elaborate sentence is completely changed. i. 26, *at hercule verbera et necem cunctis permitti*, 'Surely anyone is competent to stop murders and flogging!': the meaning is the opposite. i. 31, *in suum cognomentum adscisci imperatores*, 'and her (Rome's) emperors were appointed in their name'. Anything that this might mean is wrong. The reference is to the assumption of the title 'Germanicus' by Drusus after his German victories, and *imperatores* does not mean 'emperors'. The Bohn gives correctly 'the commanders of armies had adopted a surname derived from them'. i. 32, *quod . . . pariter ardescerent, pariter silerent* does not mean 'there was universal, silent emotion'. i. 33, *Augustae nepos, set anxius occultis in se patruī aviaeque odiis*: the adversative *set*, which has point and must be translated, is ignored. i. 73, *ut quibus initiis . . .*

inrepperit, dein repressum sit . . . noscatur, 'For they illustrate the beginnings of this disastrous institution—which Tiberius so cunningly instituted, first out of sight, then bursting into an all-engulfing blaze.' 'First out of sight' is apparently meant to render *dein repressum sit*, but it is an inaccurate paraphrase, and by hiding Tacitus' admission that Tiberius at first kept the informers under control does him an injustice. i. 80, *prorogatur Poppaeo Sabino provincia*, 'In his . . . governorship . . . P. S. stayed on and on': this implies that Sabinus was clinging to office, which Tacitus does not intend. iv. 18, . . . *quod . . . quanto maiore mole procideret, plus formidinis in alios dispersebatur*, 'so his downfall was the more spectacular and alarming': the Latin is not a statement of fact, but an oblique report of Seianus' motives. iv. 28, *idque facile intellectu, si proderentur alii*, ' . . . and that the impossibility of naming alleged accomplices proved his own guiltlessness': *id* does not refer to the speaker's guiltlessness and there seems to be no resemblance between the sense of the Latin and the English. iv. 39, *ut coniunctione Caesaris dignus crederetur*, 'to be thought worthy of marriage into your family': Seianus is not referring to his own hoped-for marriage to Livilla. iv. 49, *et struebatur agger unde saxa . . . iacerentur*, 'He also erected a mound from which boulders . . . were showered . . .': that is not what the Latin says, and there is nothing in the context to show that the mound was ever completed. iv. 50, *neque ignobiles tantum his diversi sententiis, verum e ducibus Dinis . . .*, 'Disagreement with this proposal came from an important group under the aged chief Dinis': where in the Latin is the 'important group', and what has happened to *ignobiles*? iv. 64, *actaeque ei grates apud senatum ab inlustribus fama apud populum*, 'This earned speeches of thanks in the senate and in the Assembly, where leading men addressed the populace': the latter part of the sentence is sheer invention. iv. 67: the important last sentence of the chapter is omitted. iv. 69, *tectum inter et laquearia tres senatores . . .*, 'So the three senators wedged themselves between roof and ceiling': the withering word-order of the Latin is ignored. xiv. 20, *spectaculorum quidem antiquitas . . . servaretur, quoties praetores ederent*, 'let them continue in the old Roman way, provided they became annual again, under the praetor': this is sheer paraphrase, and inaccurate at that, for it implies that the regular shows have been discontinued, and Tacitus' real point is missed. xiv. 26, *possessionem Armeniae usurpabat, cum advenit Tigranes . . .*, 'Corbulo held on to Armenia until the arrival of Nero's nominee for its throne, Tigranes V': another misleading paraphrase, for it implies that Corbulo was acting in conformity with pre-arranged policy, whereas Tacitus' Latin implies that the arrival of Tigranes was a surprise. xiv. 39, *detentusque rebus gerundis*, not 'was forbidden to conduct active operations', which makes nonsense of *in mollius relata*, but 'was retained for active operations' (cf. *Agr.* 9).

It would be unjust not to say that the greater part of the text is more accurate than the above passages suggest. Nevertheless the presence of passages which seem to have been composed with a slapdash abandon that throws the Latin to the winds makes this version unsafe for any Latinless historian seeking historical evidence. The ordinary reader will find it vigorous and will read it with enjoyment, though he may be irritated by the cluttering footnotes. It is true that ancient authors include in the text explanatory clauses and sentences which a modern author might put in a footnote, but Grant has chosen to relegate to the foot of the page most proper names, and many phrases, clauses, sentences, and even long passages, in a most arbitrary fashion.

It is
Penguin
will be

Universit

A

RUDOL

Pp. x-

This fi

publish

introdu

opposit

series is

antiqui

The

and wo

Patrae,

languag

and the

general

remarks

esting

(pp. 16

section

Oddly

lations

Augsbu

and app

Boiardo

The t

an abbr

point pr

third de

unable

text of

work. I

(1931),

omnibus

1956, as

tures by

difficult

The c

i and th

real con

depends

graphica

editor. A

led to a

It is easier to criticize a translation of Tacitus than to produce one. This fat Penguin represents a great deal of labour, and whoever pays five shillings for it will be getting his money's worth.

University of Durham

E. C. WOODCOCK

A NEW EDITION OF *THE GOLDEN ASS*

RUDOLF HELM: Apuleius' *Metamorphosen*. Lateinisch und deutsch. Pp. x+376. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Cloth, DM. 12.

THIS first volume of a new series, 'Schriften und Quellen der alten Welt', published by the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, comprises introduction (pp. 1-27), text with critical apparatus, and translation on opposite page (pp. 28-353), and notes (354-76). The declared purpose of the series is 'to bring works of ancient literature and sources for the history of antiquity before a wider circle of readers'.

The introduction deals in brief and workmanlike style with Apuleius' life and works, the relation of the *Metamorphoses* to Pseudo-Lucian and Lucius of Patrae, the subject-matter and characterization, motifs, composition, and language of the *Metamorphoses*, the date of the work, its survival and influence, and the history of the text. There is no room here for anything new, and generally accepted views are fairly and sympathetically presented. Helm's remarks on parody and burlesque in the *Metamorphoses* (pp. 13-15) are interesting and might have been expanded, while the section on composition (pp. 16-23) tends to repetitiveness and could well have been curtailed. The section on the history of the text shows full appreciation of Robertson's work. Oddly enough, in the final paragraph of the introduction, on German translations of the *Metamorphoses*, there is no mention of that by Johann Sieder, Augsburg, 1538, one of the earliest German translations of a classical work, and apparently the second vernacular translation of the *Golden Ass*, only that of Boiardo, Venice, 1523, being earlier.

The text is stated in the preface to be that of Helm's Teubner edition, with an abbreviated critical apparatus and a 'modernized orthography'. The last point presumably refers to the distinction between *u* and *v*, the suppression of third declension accusative plurals in *-is*, and the like. The reviewer has been unable to consult a copy of the 1955 reprint, with addenda, of the Teubner text of the *Metamorphoses*, which is no doubt that reproduced in the present work. It differs in a few passages in every book from that of the third edition (1931), e.g. iv. 27 *vela datum iri* Helm 1956, *viam datum iri* Helm 1931; vii. 17 *omnibus* Helm 1956, *<ex> omnibus* Helm 1931; vii. 20 *hin<num> igninum* Helm 1956, *asinum igninum* Helm 1931. Of these the first and third are new conjectures by Helm, the second is a return to the reading of F—and surely one very difficult to justify.

The critical apparatus is very brief—there are only eighteen entries for book i and thirty-seven for book ix—and in principle records only passages requiring real conjecture, as opposed to the mere tidying up inevitable when a text depends on a single manuscript. It is not always easy to read, since no typographical distinction is made between readings in the text and remarks of the editor. And in some passages anxiety for concision or careless proof-reading has led to ambiguity or worse; e.g. i. 2 *frontem* should read *frontem F verb. Vulg.*;

iv. 22 *armatim F* (*m ausradiert*), there is no indication of the source of the text printed (*armati partim*), which in fact comes from ϕ .

It is curious to observe how often Helm and Robertson, both of whom have devoted most of a lifetime to Apuleius, differ on the attribution of a conjecture. In the few cases which the reviewer has checked, Robertson has always been right.

What is entirely new in the book is Helm's translation. It is difficult for a foreigner to judge its stylistic qualities. Certainly Helm has not attempted to turn Apuleius' baroque Latin by baroque German, as did Schaeffer (Leipzig, 1926), not very successfully. And here and there in his notes he apologizes for failing to reproduce the figures of the original. But it is a very close, accurate, and clear translation. The few errors it contains are more often due to oversight than to misunderstanding. The following are all those noted in book viii:

- 7.2 *perperam delectando* belong together, while Helm takes *perperam* with *nutrire*, 'nährte so unsinnigerweise . . . indem er mit ihr spielte'.
- 9.3 *aures obstratas de nuptiis obtundens* is omitted in the translation.
- 13.3 *meis virtutibus* is hardly 'meiner Entschlossenheit'.
- 14.1 *quoque astu Thrasyllum inductum petisset* is translated as 'mit welcher List Thrasyllus ihn verlockt und angegriffen hatte', instead of 'mit welcher List sie Thrasyllus verlockt u.s.w.'.
- 15.3 *passeres* is rendered by 'Gänse', which corresponds to the reading of the second hand in *F anseres*.
- 20.2 *quae fruticibus imis subpatet* is omitted in the translation.
- 26.2 *hominem* is not 'Mann' here—which would anticipate a joke to be made a few lines later—but 'Mensch'.
- 31.3 *fortuitum* is omitted in the translation.

The notes are brief and factual, mainly explaining mythology or realia. That on i. 24. 2 on the uses of *nummus* and *denarius* in the *Metamorphoses* is interesting; some of the prices seem to be real ones in debased denarii of the later second century, others to come from the original. That on vi. 23. 2 refers to Lucian *Iup. Trag.* 15 as a parallel for the burlesque of the council of the gods in terms of the Roman senate. But surely the theme has a long history in Roman literature—e.g. the *Apocolocyntosis*, and probably Lucilius i. 1. In the notes on ii. 3. 3 and ii. 15. 3 there are false references to the introduction.

It occurs to the reviewer that the non-specialist reader—and many specialists too—would have welcomed some discussion of the value of the *Metamorphoses* as evidence for the social and economic life of Greece in the second century A.D. The picture Apuleius paints is fascinating and detailed, but is it a picture of the real world? Were the cities flourishing and prosperous communities, in which the most dangerous creatures to be found were young men returning from parties? Was the countryside alive with brigands, runaway slaves, and the like? Were whole villages inhabited by slaves working on a single estate? Were bodies of legionary soldiers to be met with in the villages of Greece, and were they armed with a *vitis* (ix. 39. 3)? To these and similar questions Helm gives no answer.

It is a pleasure to see a new series, which may one day challenge comparison with the Loeb and Budé libraries, so well inaugurated by a scholar whose vigour, accuracy, and good taste are undiminished by his eighty-five years.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

AGOSTI
gionum.

L. 3,00

SINCE Z
text of
survived
ture, it
what th
light: f
Latin o
authors
and kee
spelling
the recu
which h
with go
interpre
format
small an
pity tha
interest
introduc
author'

Since
point o
before v
regum w
commo
in the p
Empero
vention
address
been no
marian'

In th
syntax
At 2. 6
un-Egy
suppose
Vergilia
formae
rupt eff
probabl
inclined
Liberum
quoted,

FIRMICUS MATERNUS

AGOSTINO PASTORINO: Iuli Firmici Materni *De errore profanarum religionum*. Pp. lxxvi+294. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 3,000.

SINCE Ziegler's Teubner edition of 1907, we have had a usable and critical text of Firmicus' little work, founded upon the one manuscript which has survived, the Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 165. Building on so good a substructure, it was not too hard for Pastorino to give us about as near an approach to what the author wrote as we are likely to have unless more evidence comes to light: for he possesses the requisites of an editor, adequate knowledge of the Latin of that period (between 343 and 350), wide reading in relevant modern authors, and strong good sense. To a good text, inclining to a sane conservatism and keeping to the Palatinus wherever possible (he even retains some aberrant spellings, because they are possibly the author's own, such as *pecodis* in 6. 8 and the recurrent confusion of *de-* and *di-*), he joins a most useful commentary, in which he takes account of the views of a number of scholars, criticizing them with good discrimination and adding suggestions of his own as to reading or interpretation. It is in effect a first-rate variorum in moderate space, for the format of the series to which the book belongs, the *Biblioteca di Studi superiori*, is small and the print, although not large, is sufficiently so to be easily read. It is a pity that the price is high, for the book ought to be on the shelves of everyone interested in late Latin, Christian apologetics, or the later pagan cults. A long introduction gives information about the manuscript and editions and the author's language and style, and there are useful indexes.

Since the work is so good, it seems worth while to suggest a few doubts and point out one or two omissions, in hopes that there will be a second edition before very long. On p. 1 I would not count the use of *regius* where *regis* or *regum* would make equally good sense as a mark of late Latin, seeing that it is common in Livy, nor recognize anything but a Vergilian echo (cf. *Aen.* vii. 13) in the phrase *nocturno lumine*. P. lxxv, I doubt if the repeated addresses to the Emperors up and down the work are cases of apostrophe; surely it is the convention of all such communications that the author is either speaking to the addressee or writing a letter to him. At the bottom of p. lxxvii it might have been noted that such a phrase as *Mauors . . . quasi magna uertat* is regular grammarian's Latin when propounding an etymology.

In the commentary on 2. 2 *tradidit sepulturae* seems to me such normal Latin syntax of all periods that a note on late uses of the dative was hardly called for. At 2. 6 the detail *cremati corporis* [sc. *Osiridis*] *reliquiae cernuntur* strikes me as so un-Egyptian that it calls for a little comment; what and where were these supposed remains, and when and by whom was Osiris burned? In 3. 1 the Vergilian reminiscence (cf. *Aen.* i. 27) *quod irata mulier pro iniuria spretae fecerat formae* might have been noted. In 6. 7 the manuscript has the obviously corrupt *effeminatum cenatū*. Editors, including Pastorino, emend the latter word, probably rightly, to *cinaedum* and generally bracket the former. I should be inclined to keep *effeminatum*, regarding the plainer word as a gloss. On 7. 7, *Liberum ad Solem uolunt referre commenta Graecorum*, Macrobius is appositely quoted, but earlier than either he or Cornelius Labeo, his source, is Verg.,

Geor. i. 7. In 12. 2 surely *inclusam regiam uirginem* is a half-quotation of Horace, *Od.* iii. 16. 1, and on the same page there is an odd slip, 'compagno di Ercole nella spedizione contro gli Argonauti', followed by an annoying misprint, 'Prop. I. 2' for i. 20. 49. In 12. 6 who were they *qui Saturnum filio prodiderunt*? Does Firmicus mean the Hekatoncheires and other primeval figures who sided with Zeus? In 15. 2 the love of Poseidon for Pelops has earlier authority than any quoted, Pindar, *Ol.* 1. 25. In 22. 1 an earlier witness than Plutarch for the images of Adonis is Theocritus 15. 84. In 24. 2, *fregit claustra perpetua et ferrea fores Christo iubente conlapsae sunt*, I seem to catch an echo of Ps. 106 (107). 16. Finally, in the furious call to persecution of 29. 2, it is true that *siamo veramente lontani dal Vangelo*, but in fairness to Firmicus it might be mentioned that he is doing no more than paraphrase the equally intolerant passages from the Pentateuch which he has just quoted, or is about to quote.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

GREEK PHONETICS

MICHEL LEJEUNE: *Traité de Phonétique grecque*. Deuxième édition revue et corrigée. (Collection de Philologie Classique, iii.) Pp. xv+374. Paris: Klincksieck, 1955. Paper, 1,800 fr.

THE first edition of this celebrated book appeared in 1947, and won immediate recognition as an authoritative account of Greek phonetic development. The preface to the first edition is dated February 1945; that of the new edition was written exactly nine years later, at a time when it had become evident that the language of the Linear B texts is Greek, but before it was prudent to include interpretations of their phonetic features. It is therefore to be hoped that a further eight or nine years will not pass before the appearance of a third edition in which at least the best established phonetic characteristics of Mycenaean Greek may find a place.

The new edition has been made by a photographic process which has allowed for the most part only slight changes in the text, despite skilful use of spaces between paragraphs and at the end of sections. Some of these changes are important, and all are valuable, but the reader should not expect too much from the statement (p. xi) 'Il n'y a cependant guère de pages dont le texte n'ait été retouché'. The chief additions, in which account is taken both of the intervening nine years' work and of suggestions made in reviews of the first edition, are contained in fifteen pages of 'Notes additionnelles', inserted at the end of the book before the indexes, which have been revised to include references to them. In the method of treatment there is no change; in particular structural-phonological principles are still excluded (p. xi), although the interest and importance of certain statistical methods is now recognized in the additional note to § 2. The treatment remains predominantly historical, and the chronology of sound changes, in the establishment of which this work excels, receives still greater prominence in the additional notes to §§ 39 and 96. To this aspect of Greek phonetic history, as the author recognizes (p. xii), the decipherment of Mycenaean Greek is bound to bring changes; it may, for example, be questioned whether the account of the labio-velars will remain substantially unchanged in the next edition as it has in this. Fresh evidence or

further
empha
κύκλος
etc.) a
major
note, is
is now
In § 18
stated
Altho
contro
of these
of *veip*
tion wh
the dev
vowel
them.
signific
discuss
those o
tions (i
other f
tional
account
tion be
This
scholar
of mate
views o
main u
accord

Westfield

H. I. M
Lamb.
425. ne
M. MA
well de
prehens
as for i
durabil
The
successf
careless
mislead
We hav

further reflection has led to some changes of view and modifications of emphasis. In § 28 and the related additional note there is a re-assessment of κύκλος and of νυκτ-/νυχ-; here, as in the additional notes to § 25 (on χθών etc.) and § 109 (on χεῖρ), Hittite testimony is more fully exploited. One of the major changes in the text, accompanied by further discussion in an additional note, is in the treatment of φεφρ-, φεφλ- in § 167, where early Attic orthography is now shown to invalidate the explanation of εἶρημαι etc. by dissimilation. In § 181 and the note referring to it the theory of such groups as *iə is now stated with greater precision.

Although this book is, with a few exceptions, not concerned with detailed controversy, some points may seem to deserve further comment or discussion; of these the following is a selection. The statement (§ 31, explaining the labial of *veίφει*) '*veίφω* a *dû* exister' raises an intriguing speculation about the question who could have said 'I snow' (Zeus?). Whereas in the first edition (§ 170) the development of a stress accent is said to have abolished the oppositions of vowel quantity, the new edition asserts that it effected a new distribution of them. Since 'opposition' as a linguistic term so often connotes functional or significant difference, the earlier formulation has much to be said for it. In discussing 'voyelles d'appui' (§ 188) Lejeune makes no distinction between those of which the emergence appears to be subject to purely phonetic conditions (i.e. in heavy or unpronounceable consonant groups) and those for which other factors seem partly accountable (such as *πάρος*, *ἐδάρην*). In the additional note to § 126 expressive gemination is suggested, if very tentatively, to account for the double consonant of *κάλλος*; but would not expressive gemination be even more likely in the adjective than in the substantive?

This new edition needs, in fact, no long review. The high standard of its scholarship, its exemplary accuracy and clarity of exposition, the apt choice of material, the excellence of the indexes—all these merits, acclaimed in reviews of the first edition and proved by the experience of ten years' use, remain undiminished. It is enough to endorse for the second edition the praise accorded to the first.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

GREEK AND ROMAN EDUCATION

H. I. MARROU: *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. Pp. xviii+466; 1 map. London: Sheed & Ward, 1956. Cloth, 42s. net.

M. MARROU's *Histoire de l'Éducation dans l'Antiquité*, first published in 1948, well deserved translation into English. It is a work remarkable for its comprehensiveness and the wide and varied learning on which it is based, as well as for its wit and intelligence. In its English form, superior to the French in durability and legibility, it deserves to be widely read.

The translation, though it is done with considerable verve and skill and successfully conveys the lively quality of Marrou's writing, is marred by a carelessness in matters of detail which will irritate the scholar and sometimes mislead the layman. Proper names are given in incorrect or unfamiliar form. We have Phaeaces for Phaeacians, Boreus for Boreas, Titho for Tithonus,

Locres for Locri, Machabees for Maccabees, Callipidos for Callipides, Trezenians for Troezenians, Pheres for Pherae, Nicobolus for Nicobulus, Lympus for Olympus, Eustathes for Eustathius, Phalera for Phalerum, Cepion for Caepio, Portius for Porcius, Heduan for Aeduan, Aristippes for Aristippus. More seriously misleading are such mistakes as Lucian for the French 'Lucaïn', Plato's *Politics* for 'le Politique', Dionysius of Prusa for 'Dion de Pruse', Claudius Mamertinus for 'Claudien Mamert' (Mamertus Claudianus) and 'the Confessions of Paulinus of Pella' for 'les confessions de Paulin de Pella'. Nor is the translator happy with technical terms. His apparent unfamiliarity with the term *θεωρηκὸν* has resulted in a confused sentence on p. 8; he gives us forms like 'hetairias' and 'atheteses'; uses *suasio* for *suasoria*; refers to tyrannicides as 'tyrannoctones'; writes of the Cynical instead of the Cynic school of philosophy and of the Portico instead of the Stoa or the Porch. One has the suspicion that he did not fully understand the original when he wrote 'the song Ψ in the *Iliad* with its accompanying funeral games in honour of Patroclus' or 'Athena instructing Telemachus under the guidance of Mentos or of Mentor' or 'a throne high up in the air' for the sophist's raised seat, as if Hippias in the *Protagoras* held forth from a seat suspended from the roof. He may have known what he meant by 'the modern ecdotic operation', but many of his readers will not.

But the book can survive such faults on the part of the translator, as well as a few misprints and carelessnesses which have survived uncorrected from the French edition. In the eight years which have elapsed since its original publication it has probably received all the useful criticism that can be made of it. But one or two small points which have occurred to the reviewer may be mentioned.

Marrou is surely wrong in supposing that the later first century A.D. saw a reaction in favour of the old poets in the Roman grammar school. The passage of Quintilian to which he refers does not support this (see Colson's note on Quint. i. 8. 8-12) and Suetonius (*Gram.* 24) makes it clear that by the later first century the older poets had disappeared from the Roman schools. They had given place to Virgil and other recent poets, though I doubt if the evidence quite justifies Marrou's statement that every successful poet was studied in the schools in his own lifetime. It would be safer to say that every poet hoped to be so studied, which is another way of saying he hoped to be recognized as a classic.

In the sections on the *progymnasmata* it would have been interesting to have some discussion of Suetonius' remarks in *De Grammaticis* 4, which suggest that the teaching of *progymnasmata* by the *grammatici* was a survival from the days when grammar and rhetoric were often taught by the same person. Whether this is right or not, it appears that the practice came to an end soon after Quintilian, for when Suetonius wrote the Latin *grammatici* had apparently ceased to teach composition altogether.

In his discussion of the language question in the Roman Empire Marrou appears to misinterpret the evidence of Paulinus of Pella. Though I do not think it affects the validity of his general argument about the decline of Greek in the West, it should be pointed out that of the two languages which Paulinus had to study it was Greek, not Latin, with which he was more familiar.

Pointing out the absence of any real technical or professional education (with the exception of medicine and, under the Roman empire, of law)

Marrou
way of
prentice
architect
a profess
builder;
training;
following
general
tectural
under a
ture such
between
was imp
character
highly in

It is s
Marrou
thought
practice
M. Ma
Hellenis
earlier
the four
Isocrate
domina
consider
lost in a
of us w
Greece
culture
Roman
writers
age of
and the
dull an
happen
of 187
would
very d
M. M
politic
level o
instruc
prima

Universi

Marrou writes: 'the technician learnt his job in a very simple archaic way, the way of personal relationship between master and pupil, craftsman and apprentice'. Does this quite represent the situation in architecture? The ancient architect was not, as was the medieval architect, a master-craftsman. He was a professional man, a designer and superintendent of building rather than a builder; and, as Vitruvius shows, there was a strong intellectual element in his training, *ratiocinatio* as well as *fabrica*. Moreover, as Vitruvius, no doubt following Greek sources, makes clear, the architect was expected to have a good general education. In the time of Constantine the age for beginning an architectural training was eighteen (see *Cod. Theod.* xii. 4. 1), which would be late under a system of apprenticeship. There were, it is true, no schools of architecture such as we are familiar with today, but in the ancient world the distinction between a school and a professional man with a few pupils was slight. What was important was not so much the way in which training was organized as the character of the training, and there was nothing simple or archaic about the highly intellectual discipline of ancient architecture.

It is sometimes said that no books are duller than those on education. M. Marrou's is an exception. It not only conveys information but also stimulates thought, not only by its incidental observations and comparisons with modern practice, but also by the plan of the work as a whole. Ancient education for M. Marrou is the 'classical' education, as he calls it, which began in the Hellenistic age and was adopted almost without change by the Romans. The earlier period, down to the fourth century B.C., he treats as introductory; the founders of the classical education were Plato and Isocrates, and of these Isocrates was by far the more influential. This Hellenistic education, predominantly literary and rhetorical in character, is treated by M. Marrou with considerable sympathy, a sympathy tinged with regret for a cultural unity lost in an age of specialisms. Yet his book is not exactly encouraging to those of us who are engaged in the business of education. The great creative age of Greece was one in which there was very little formal education, and Greek culture declined as education spread. Much the same was the case at Rome; Roman culture, it is true, was always based on learning, but most of the great writers flourished before there was any regular system of education. The great age of education, the age in which the state encouraged schools and teachers and the praise of *paideia* was a commonplace, was the later Empire, and how dull and uncreative were the intellectuals of that age! Is something similar happening in our own age, and will posterity look back on the Education Acts of 1870 and 1902 as successive stages in the decline of English culture? It would no doubt be rash to draw analogies between the ancient world and our very different modern civilization, but we do well to remind ourselves that, in M. Marrou's words, 'men like Pericles and Sophocles and Phidias, who, in politics and literature and the arts, brought classical culture to such a high level of maturity, had only an elementary education, which as far as actual instruction is concerned was not much higher than the level of our present-day primary schools'.

University College, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

STUDIES IN GREEK POETRY

CARLO DEL GRANDE: *Filologia Minore*. Studi di poesia e storia nella Grecia antica da Omero a Bisanzio. Pp. 378. Milan: Ricciardi, 1956. Paper, L. 2,500.

THE sub-title of this book gives some indication of the extremely wide range of the author's interests. We have here a collection of twenty-eight papers, a few of which have already been published, dealing with topics in the fields of epic and lyric poetry, comedy, tragedy, metrics, Hellenistic poetry, and Byzantine studies. Half of these are short notes of a page or two, and the rest vary in length from five to thirty-five pages. Within the limits of this notice I cannot discuss every article, and some are outside my range of knowledge, but I will make some brief comments on the more important articles and indicate the subjects of others. In the first paper on the Discovery of Ethical Concepts in Archaic Greece, del Grande compares earlier and more rigid systems, as illustrated by the Code of Hammurabi, with the more flexible approach of the Greeks of the 'Homeric Age', by which he means the eighth to seventh centuries. He speaks rightly of the sense of moral responsibility in the heroes of the Homeric poems, but his argument that passages where the speaker puts the blame on Zeus or the gods (e.g. *Iliad* xix. 85) are purely dramatic is not convincing. It might perhaps be argued that Agamemnon is merely excusing himself, but Achilles had already ascribed the blame to Zeus in ix. 377. Moreover Agamemnon could only excuse himself by reference to some generally acceptable notion. It is probably better to accept the possibility of 'double determination'. Other articles on early Greek poetry include a good discussion on the meanings of *αἰδός* and *ῥαψωδός* and a paper on Solon's Elegy to the Muses, in which the apparent inconsistency of 67-70 with the rest of the poem is explained by the assumption that these lines are an imaginary objection to which an answer is supplied in the subsequent lines. If so, one would have expected a clearer indication of this in the text, and some contemporary example of this rhetorical device would help. The passage which del Grande adduces from Solon fr. 23 (Diehl) 1-7 does not seem to me to provide a satisfactory parallel. In his seventh paper on Tyrtaeus, Elegy 9 (Diehl), after a survey of the arguments for and against authenticity, he analyses the poem and on grounds of form and content argues strongly on the side of Jaeger and others that the poem is to be ascribed to Tyrtaeus and was probably composed at the time of the Second Messenian War. In three papers on Pindar del Grande discusses *Ol.* 2 at some length. In 6 he argues for keeping the manuscript reading *ὅτι δίκαιον ξένον*, and in 54 he takes *πλοῦτος . . . ὑπέχων μέριμναν* as 'wealth checking or restraining anxiety'. In reviewing the structure of the Ode he thinks that the notion of Fortune's Wheel may have been present in Pindar's mind, but does not believe that it dominates the whole Ode to the extent that Norwood supposes. In a paper on *Ol.* 1 he concentrates on the problem of the reference in *τέταρτος πόνος* (60), a problem variously solved from the scholiasts onwards and pronounced by Wilamowitz to be insoluble. His view, that the fourth *πόνος* is the *βίος ἀπάλαμος* referred to in the previous line, immortal life burdened with the triple punishment of hunger, thirst, and the stone, seems to be open to several objections. In a long paper on Bacchylides

del Grande
translate
mate of
actually
non altr
paper lie
is based.
after πό
φεγγεῖς
the 'mo
μαίρεν
view, bu
'Ελλάδι
Persae 4
Athenae
of the σ
many sc
on the st
tions on
differenc
of some
with som
Virgil. T
a reprint
with the
contains
the book
and in m
also a g
index re
than the

The b
wide fiel
is schola
I fear,
publish

Bedford C

H. WA
ix+316

PROFESS
A group
articles
not one
them m
well don

del Grande gives a good survey of current estimates of the poet, analyses, translates, and briefly discusses all the Odes, and concludes with his own estimate of the value of the Odes as poetry. This might be summed up in words actually applied to the Croesus myth in Ode 3 'letteratura buona e piacente, non altro'. This is perhaps what most scholars would say, but the interest of the paper lies in the author's attempt to decide on what specific facts this impression is based. He next deals with Timotheus, *Persae* 99-108, where he prints a stop after *πόδας* in 102 instead of after *ναός* as in Wilamowitz, and takes *μαρμαροφειγείς παῖδες* to mean Greek warriors in glittering armour and στόμα *ναός* as the 'mouth' of the ship from which they emerge. The frequent use of *μαρμαίρειν* of armour in the *Iliad* might have been mentioned in support of his view, but for *παῖδες* in the sense 'warriors' there is no true parallel in *παῖδες Ἑλλήνων*, the common periphrasis with the genitive, which he cites from *Persae* 402. In a paper on the well-known fragment of Pratinas preserved by Athenaeus del Grande argues that 16-18 describe movements characteristic of the *σίκυνις*; if so the fragment is demonstrably part of a satyric drama, as many scholars already believe it to be. The last article in the classical period is on the style of Callimachus, and here del Grande makes useful detailed observations on the use of metaphorical expressions in Callimachus and brings out differences between his more elaborate and learned style and the limp style of some narrative passages, such as the myth in *Hymn* 5. 57 ff. He concludes with some interesting examples of the influence of Callimachus on the style of Virgil. The last three articles deal with the Hymn of Acathistus (the first being a reprint of the introduction to an edition of the Hymn published in 1948) and with the preservation of the classical tradition at Byzantium. An appendix contains a reprint of a public lecture on Archytas and his times. At the end of the book there are valuable notes to each article, dealing with points of detail and in most cases giving a select critical bibliography of the subject. There is also a good index locorum, particularly necessary in a book of this kind; an index rerum would also have been welcome, and probably more worth while than the index of modern authors quoted.

The book as a whole makes a useful contribution to Greek studies over a very wide field, and even where the arguments do not carry conviction the treatment is scholarly and stimulating, with a wealth of detail of which this notice has, I fear, hardly given an adequate conception. Whether it is really best to publish a series of articles on unrelated topics in book form is another matter.

Bedford College, London

P. T. STEVENS

SOME GARNERED SHEAVES

H. WAGENVOORT: *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*. Pp. ix+316. Leiden: Brill, 1956. Cloth, fl. 30.

PROFESSOR WAGENVOORT of Utrecht was seventy years old in August 1956. A group of his pupils had the happy thought of collecting a selection of his articles (to include all his minor works would mean publishing several volumes, not one only) and presenting them to him in an English version, thus making them more readily accessible to the learned world. The translation has been well done, scarcely an unidiomatic turn of phrase testifying to the nationality

of the translator; doubtless part of the credit here is due to Mr. D. A. S. Reid, of the English Seminar at Amsterdam University, who is thanked along with other helpers in the brief introduction. The principle of selection has been to include only papers which involve knowledge of more than Latin literature and deal with those border territories which especially interest their author, especially the interrelations of Roman literature and religion. Contributions to *Mnemosyne* have been excluded as being readily available in its files.

The result is a group of fourteen items, arranged chronologically and ranging between 1929 and 1955 (the last a hitherto unpublished address). Their titles are: (i) Virgil's Fourth Eclogue and the Sidus Iulium; (ii) Ludus poeticus; (iii) Princeps; (iv) Horace and Virgil; (v) Caerimonia; (vi) Orcus; (vii) 'Rebirth' in Profane Antique Literature; (viii) Initia Cereris; (ix) The Crime of Fratricide; (x) Fas sit uidisse; (xi) The Origin of the Ludi Saeculares; (xii) Virgil's Eclogues i and ix; (xiii) Isles of the Blessed and Insula Tiberina; (xiv) The Parentatio in honour of Romulus. Several of these are of course already well known, and concerning No. xii I have said all that I had to say elsewhere (*C.R.* n.s. iv. 301, *Mnem.*). I proceed to a few remarks on the rest.

Nos. i, vii, and xii have a bond of union, in that they all make more or less extended reference to the hotly debated question of when Vergil was occupied in writing (as opposed to collecting and publishing) the *Eclogues* and the relation of the wonder-child in *Ecl.* iv to the comet which appeared during the funeral games for Julius Caesar. It is not necessary to agree with all the ideas put forward to profit by reading or re-reading them, for a scholar of Wagenvoort's calibre is suggestive even when one thinks him mistaken. No. ii is perhaps the most purely literary item in the collection; it examines the use of *ludere* when poetical composition is meant and proves that it need not signify that the poems in question are trifling or very short. No. iii deals with the precise significance of the word which forms its title, with especial reference to its significance when used of the Emperors. No. iv, an extract from a longer article, supports a theory which I hope is not correct, that the friendship between the two poets cooled towards the end of Vergil's life. Nos. v, vi, and viii all examine the etymology and original sense of important words in the religious vocabulary. The first accepts the close relation between *caerimonia* and *caerul(e)us*, taking the primary sense of the stem to be 'dark', and a *caerimonia* therefore to be a dark or secret matter, known only to experts such as the pontifices. The second takes Orcus to mean originally a place, not a god, related to *orca* as *portus* is to *porta* and implying that the abode of the dead was spacious but with a narrow entrance, like the neck of a jar or pitcher. The third interprets *initia Cereris* as 'beginnings of growing-power', from a supposed *cerus* (neut.) which has also given rise to the (originally adjectival) name of the goddess. No. ix treats of the story of the slaying of Remus by his brother and the strange uses made of it especially in political propaganda. No. x handles the danger of seeing any deity with mortal eyes. No. xi largely depends upon, what No. xiii also refers to, a plausible theory that Mars was, to begin with, a god of the underworld, connected in consequence both with death and with fertility. If this is so, it is easy to believe that the Terentum was his underground altar, and that the Insula Tiberina, traditionally connected with his Campus, may have been in very early times the place from which the souls of the dead set out on their voyage to the other world, an idea to which the author readily finds parallels in the beliefs of other peoples of Indo-Germanic speech. No. xiv handles very

briefly a
voort wi

The p
most of v
a few me
Zama on
the phra
words th

St. Andrew

SI

SIEGFRIED
Arbeits-
in Mainz
12.) Pp

THIS is
It deals
administ
Part ii w

This p
these sla
the divi
smelting
by-prod
from the
becomes

Lauffe
by stress
different
smelting
which m
of these
one type
xxxvii, a
could be
its slave
which co
likely th
with son
the 'unc
hire, ow
Dioclides
if we ma
slaves w
keeping

The c
necessit

briefly a suggestion regarding the *di parentes* which it is to be hoped Wagenvoort will find opportunity to discuss somewhere at greater length.

The printing is clear and good, but marred by rather numerous errors, most of which are listed in a page of *errata* at the end of the book. I have noticed a few more, of which the only one worth mention is the odd blunder *Fama* for *Zama* on p. 294, line 2. There is one little slip of the author himself on p. 111; the phrase in *communem locum* in the prologue to the *Casina* states in so many words that it was written after Plautus' death.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

SLAVES IN ATHENIAN SILVER MINES

SIEGFRIED LAUFFER: *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*. Erster Teil: Arbeits- und Betriebsverhältnisse, Rechtsstellung. (Akad. der Wiss, in Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Kl., 1955, No. 12.) Pp. 117. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956. Paper, DM. 9.

THIS is Part i of a work in two parts on the slaves of the Attic silver mines. It deals with the material conditions under which the slaves worked, the administration of the mines so far as it concerned them, and their legal status. Part ii will discuss their general significance in the society of the time.

This part opens with a discussion of such matters as the terminology for these slaves, the degree to which free labour was employed in the mines, the division of the operations into mining proper, haulage, milling, and smelting, description of tools, shift-working, physical conditions in the mines, by-products, etc. In all these matters, Lauffer argues, the slave, as distinct from the free, status of the worker made little difference. Slave status only becomes relevant when we examine how the industry was administered.

Lauffer begins this, the most interesting and controversial section of Part i, by stressing an important, and often neglected, distinction between three different kinds of economic unit, the mine proper, the crushing mill, and the smelting works on the one hand, and on the other the business 'undertaking', which might comprise one or more of these units. Normally, he suggests, each of these units would have, as an integral part of it, its own body of slaves. For one type at least, the mill, the evidence provided by Demosthenes' speech xxxvii, against Pantaenetus, and by a number of *horoi* shows how such a unit could be bought and sold, leased or hypothecated, all as a going concern with its slaves included. We have not the same evidence for the mines themselves, which could only be leased, not bought or hypothecated; but here too it seems likely that normally a group of slaves 'belonged' to a particular mine, though with some of the important mining families the connexion might be more with the 'undertaking' than with the unit. There was in addition a pool of slaves for hire, owned in large numbers as by Nicias or Ariston or even singly as by Diocles (Andoc. i. 38), on which entrepreneurs could draw. But even here, if we may take the case of Nicias described in Xenophon *Poroi* 4. 14 as typical, slaves were let out in gangs in such a way that the entrepreneur was liable for keeping the gang up to strength as a unit.

The economic consequences of this system, combined as it was with the necessity, if a mining lease was to prove profitable, for getting the quickest

possible returns, are ably worked out by Lauffer. There are, however, a few points where he seems to me to press the evidence too far or to draw doubtful deductions from it.

1. In discussing the capital value of a slave he assumes on p. 65 that the two sums of 6,000 and 4,500 drachmai lent to Pantaenetus on the security of a mill and of 30 slaves were secured severally by the mill and the slaves and that therefore the value of one slave as a pledge was 150 drachmai. This is a most unsafe assumption, as was already pointed out by Finley in *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens*, p. 259 n. 110, to which Lauffer himself refers.

2. In estimating the profitability of these slaves, whether to owners who let them out or to entrepreneurs who hired them, he asks how it was that a slave thus hired could earn for his owner in a year some 30 per cent. of his purchase price, whereas the usual rate of interest on money lent on good security was 12 per cent. He suggests on p. 72 that it was because capital was in relatively freer supply than slaves. But this merely restates the problem; for if the demand for slaves was continually pressing on the supply, why did not the price of slaves rise until there was a closer relation between the returns on capital invested in slaves and on that lent out at interest?

3. There is an elaborate argument on pp. 94 ff. to show that there was a greater tendency in raising loans on mining mills to associate the slaves with the buildings than in other kinds of security transactions. But (a) the case is based on a comparison between *horoi* and it is unsafe to argue from the absence of slaves from a *horos* that they did not form part of the relevant security. The main, if not the only, object of the *horoi* was to warn possible creditors or purchasers that the land, house, or factory in question was not at the free disposal of the occupier and there was therefore no compelling need to include on it the full terms of the transaction to which it witnessed. Nor can I understand, even on Lauffer's premisses, why it was in the *debtor's* interest to see that the pledged slaves were mentioned on the stone (p. 96). (b) Lauffer argues that *a priori* the value of slaves in relation to site would be higher in the mining area than elsewhere. But is not the reverse true? You could, within limits, have a bed factory or a knife factory where you liked, but a crushing mill had to be near the mine head.

4. I find Lauffer's elucidation of the Pantaenetus case no more satisfying than that of previous scholars. In the first place I suggest that it is misleading to use the word 'owner' (*Eigentümer*) at all in this context. The Greeks had not achieved any clear distinction between the concepts of ownership and possession and there would have been no way of asking a Greek 'Did Pantaenetus at such and such a moment *own* the mill or did he not?' All that we can say is that, until he sold the property *καθάπαξ*, he retained throughout the right to free it by repaying the loan and that since the price he finally got was about twice the amount of the loan this right was a valuable consideration. Secondly, it was Pantaenetus who in the end did sell the property outright and not, as Lauffer says on p. 101, Nicobulus. Moreover, this outright sale did not take place, as Lauffer seems to think, at the time when Nicobulus was repaid but later (*ὕστερον*). Lauffer has perhaps been misled by ignoring Finley's warning (*Studies*, p. 228 n. 33) that the word *παρατήρ* does not mean 'seller' but 'warrantor'.

The last few pages of Part I give a short but useful account of the legal liability of slaves and their masters and of the law relating to delicts in the mines.

Dr. Lauffer is doing a great service to social, economic, and legal historians by his scholarly and comprehensive reappraisal of the ancient evidence on this topic and of modern interpretations of it. Part ii will be eagerly awaited. It is to be hoped that it will include an index of subjects and of passages cited, as well as an alphabetical list of modern works. The last is especially desirable since it is often difficult to trace the original reference to a work when it is cited later by page number only.

Merton College, Oxford

A. R. W. HARRISON

ATHENS AND SICILY

H. WENTKER: *Sizilien und Athen*. Die Begegnung der attischen Macht mit den Westgriechen. Pp. 198. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1956. Paper.

MR. WENTKER sets out to explain the Athenian interventions in Sicily in the light of the previous development of the Sicilian cities and their relations to the homeland, and of the general aims of Athenian policy. His range of learning is considerable (though on several points he should have consulted *A.T.L.* ii-iii), and his ingenuity striking; many pages in his book, e.g. on Ducetius (54-56, 72), the alliance of Athens and Egesta (65 ff.), Pericles' western policy after 446 (83-99), and the whole section on the Peloponnesian war, especially on the Congress of Gela and Alcibiades' designs, will demand attention, though they may not compel agreement: they cannot be summarized here.

Wentker is fertile in new suggestions, but his work is marred by dogmatic preconceptions and a frequent misuse of evidence. Even those, like myself, who do not believe that commercial interests made Corinth hostile to Athens will find his rejection of this view (pp. 12-13, 62-63) too summary (besides the works cited in n. 21 he should have examined C. H. V. Sutherland's article, *A.J.P.* lxiv); it goes much too far to say 'Korinth war keine Handelstadt mit Handelskolonien im Westen' and he is wrong to suppose that that theory is mainly founded on Hdt. ii. 67 (n. 284); Thuc. i. 13 and Strabo 378 do not mean that at all times Corinthian interest in commerce was confined to the profits of the emporium (cf. besides the archaeological evidence, Str. 382). And before asserting that Corinth had no imperialist aims he should have reckoned with the evidence set out by Kahrstedt, *Gr. Staatsrecht*, pp. 357 ff.

A theme that runs through the book on almost every page is the closeness of family ties that bound together the old nobility of Greek cities and in particular held the colonial nobility in a sort of client relationship to that ruling the metropolis. It is, however, apparent from p. 13, where this theory is first advanced, that there is no evidence for such a relationship existing in general between colony and metropolis in the fifth and fourth centuries. Wentker seeks to justify it by examples—the Epidamnus affair and the help given by Corinth to Syracuse on several occasions. Here we have appeals to kinship. But British people regard Australians or Canadians as their kin; that in itself does not imply kinship between governing nobilities. Even to begin proving his case, Wentker has to show that in metropolis and colony concerned the nobility were in power. Certainly Corinth was oligarchical, but there is no evidence, and no likelihood, that the ruling class was exclusively or mainly noble (cf. now E.

Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 615–24). At Corcyra (whose bad relations with Corinth are anyhow difficult for Wentker), Thuc. iii. 70 shows that the form of constitution was democratic and the popular party strong; there is no case for speaking of 'a ruling nobility'. (Corcyra backed oligarchs at Epidamnus, but Athens too sometimes supported this class.) At Syracuse it is arbitrary to identify the upper classes of post-Dinomenid times with the Gamoroi, who are no longer heard of. (Nor are their Cillyrian serfs; Polyæn. i. 43, Diod. xiv. 7. 4 need not refer to them.) Phrases like οἱ χαριέστατοι τῶν πολιτῶν (n. 236) do not necessarily denote nobles (cf. e.g. Plut. C. Gr. 9. 2). With characteristic perversity Wentker implies (n. 31) that Ps.-Xenophon, *Ab. II.* contrasts a noble class with the *demos*, but his 'good' men are those of 'birth and wealth' (i. 2). Aristotle does not even find it necessary to discuss the *Adelsherrschaft* which Wentker presumes to be so common. He always contrasts democracy with government by the rich, or the rich and educated and 'virtuous'. At most he notes that the rich are more likely to be well-born (1293^b37: cf. 1294^a20). But σχεδὸν παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις οἱ εὐποροὶ τῶν καλῶν κάγαθῶν δοκοῦσι κατέχειν χώραν (1294^a18). This had surely been true since the archaic period, when nobles deplored the new slogan, χρήματ' ἀνὴρ.

In any case Syracuse was not from 466 to 406 an oligarchy, but as Diod. xi. 68. 6 and, more important, the contemporary Thucydides say, a democracy. Wentker denies it, citing *Pol.* 1304^a27: καὶ ἐν Συρακούσαις ὁ δῆμος αἰτίας γενομένου τῆς νίκης τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους ἐκ πολιτείας εἰς δημοκρατίαν μετέβαλεν. This means, he says (neglecting the parallel with Athens before 461 in this same chapter of the *Politics*), that only the hoplites had the franchise (cf. 1297^b24); he adds that they were subservient to the nobility. But it is much too absolute to hold that by 'polity' Aristotle mean just one clearly defined set of institutions (cf. *Pol.* iv. 7 and 10). Democracy, polity, oligarchy in his descriptions merge into each other, and polity inclines rather to democracy (1293^b35). Hence Aristotle himself can also describe the post-Dinomenid régime as democracy (1316^a33); and perhaps in 1304^a27 he meant chiefly that before Diocles' reforms in 412 (Diod. xiii. 34) it lacked the characteristic device of extreme democracy, the lot. One can see why Wentker should write (n. 237, my italics): 'Für eine syrakusische Demokratie nach attischem Muster spricht nichts.' Still, for 'nichts' read Thuc. vii. 55. 2 (cf. perhaps vi. 20. 3; 63. 2; viii. 96. 5)! Enough detail is known to call Syracuse democratic. The 'πλῆθος' enjoys power, though threatened by plots (vi. 38. 1), and Athenagoras defends democracy as it exists at Syracuse (vi. 39). The Assembly passes laws (Diod. xi. 72, 86–87, xiii. 34; Thuc. vi. 72–73), instructs ambassadors to seek alliance (vi. 73), probably discusses peace-terms (vi. 103), certainly the military situation (vi. 34 ff., 72), appoints and deposes generals (vi. 73, 103), appoints *nomothetai* (Diod. xiii. 34), 'petalizes' dangerous persons (Diod. xi. 87) and settles the fate of prisoners (Diod. xi. 92, xiii. 33). There is free debate (vi. 34 ff., 103), private persons make motions (vi. 73, vii. 21); demagogues (such as Athenagoras and Diocles) and even sycophants flourish (Diod. xi. 87; how Wentker can see in 'petalism' an aristocratic measure baffles comprehension). True, in Thuc. vi. 41 the generals dissolve the assembly without allowing a decision, but Wentker does not notice that it was the demagogue, Athenagoras, who expressed confidence in them (vi. 40), not the high-born Hermocrates (cf. also 72), none of whose proposals was accepted. I find no evidence to suggest, much less prove, that the assembly had 'rein akklamative

Funktionen' (p. 53), nor to refer to this period Hesychius, s.v. ἑσκλητος· ἡ τῶν ἐξόχων συνάθροισις ἐν Συρακούσαις; if it then existed, it may have resembled the Areopagus before 461 in powers, and Athens was then already to some degree a democracy.

Believing in a family link between ruling aristocracies at Corinth and Syracuse, Wentker argues that there was a serious danger to Athens that Syracuse, after subduing Sicily, would come to Corinth's aid in old Greece. Such an intervention would have been unparalleled; the Siceliotes did not respond in practice to Sparta's appeal in 431, and even after 413 gave the Peloponnesians little help. Segesta stressed such a danger, but (apart from Nicias' cogent reply, vi. 11 ff.) I find no evidence in the speeches or in Thucydides' remarks in iii. 86, 115, iv. 65, vi. 1, 15, 24 or elsewhere that such a danger was an important motive for Athenian intervention at any time. And, *contra* Wentker, p. 2, Thucydides does not say (ii. 65) that the expedition of 415 was not a mistake at all, but only that worse followed.

The book abounds in distortions and omissions of evidence, which cannot be listed here. All too often the texts cited neither say nor suggest what Wentker alleges. (The citation of Diod. xvi. 76. 4-5 on p. 52 is not untypical.) None the less, if he will use his evidence with more caution, exactitude, and candour, and clear his mind of certain dogmas, we may expect him to produce better work than this unusually wide-ranging and provocative doctoral dissertation.

Oriel College, Oxford

P. A. BRUNT

GREEK CITY-BUILDINGS

ROLAND MARTIN: *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*. Pp. 304; 32 plates, 64 figs. Paris: Picard, 1956. Paper, 3,500 fr.

THIS is in every way an admirable book. No one is better qualified to write an authoritative account of Greek city-building than M. Martin, who has done important work on a number of interesting sites and has written a masterly account of the most vital element in the plan of the city, the agora. The present work falls into three sections. In the first Martin summarizes what ancient authors say on the subject. He perhaps pays too much respect to Vitruvius, whose ideas on the orientation of streets (i. 11) are alien both to Greek practice and to common sense. He adds a particularly interesting chapter on laws and regulations affecting architectural development and the control of the city's streets and buildings, giving a translation and detailed discussion of the notable Pergamene law. 'Les cités grecques', he concludes, 'avaient ainsi à leur disposition une réglementation très précise pour conduire leurs grands travaux d'intérêt public et avaient réalisé toutes les conditions nécessaires au développement d'un urbanisme systématique.' For the method of recruitment of public architects (p. 70), one might compare what is said about the selection of medical officers, etc., in Plato's *Gorgias* (455 b, 514 d).

The second part deals with 'l'évolution architecturale des villes', first the most ancient cities—Martin emphasizes their great variety of site and form—then the type of plan associated with the name of Hippodamus, whose part in the process he defines as clearly as possible with such a shadowy figure. A special chapter is devoted to 'Pergame et l'urbanisme monumental', and he

does full justice to the originality, power, and influence of the Pergamene architects. 'Pergame introduit dans l'histoire de l'urbanisme grec une conception sinon nouvelle, du moins consciemment développée: le sens du monumental et de la composition d'ensemble.' He tentatively derives this new spirit from eastern sources by way of Halicarnassus.

The third and final part analyses the structure of the city in greater detail, beginning with the general plan. Of the fortifications Martin rightly says: 'Il reste en tout cas certain que l'enceinte n'apparaît dans le plan urbain de la Grèce antique que pour les raisons pratiques et défensives. Elle n'est pas une donnée primitive du plan.' Of Greek city streets he says; 'La rue est réduite à son seul rôle utilitaire: assurer les courants de circulation; rôle purement fonctionnel que ne vient agrémenter, sauf rares exceptions, aucun décor architectural'; of houses: 'On peut dire que l'architecture grecque n'a pas connu la valeur des façades. Dans la cité classique, toutes les recherches architecturales sont réservées aux édifices publics.' Martin works in valuable sections on drainage, water-supply and fountains, parks and gardens. Finally he deals with the great centres of public life, religious and political. Making a comparison with medieval cathedral cities he remarks: 'Le sanctuaire grec ne joue pas ce rôle privilégié d'élément directeur du plan.'

In this way Martin covers the ground very thoroughly, using literary and epigraphical sources in close association with the archaeological remains. There is probably nothing of importance which could have been added at the time of writing. Very recently the ingenious use of air photography has begun to make useful contributions on some sites where little could be expected from the more usual methods. Martin gives a plan of ancient Rhodes as worked out by I. D. Kontis (*Συμβολή εἰς τὴν μελέτην τῆς ῥυμοτομίας τῆς Ῥόδου*, 1954) showing how a chessboard scheme was applied to a wide area of the peninsula, much of it probably not being built up. J. Bradford has now supplemented and modified this plan by means of the examination of air photographs supplemented by further work on the ground (*The Antiquaries Journal*, xxxvi, Jan.-April 1956).

Drawings and photographs are plentiful and of good quality. Sometimes they tend to lag a little awkwardly behind the text.

Martin writes with clarity and with enthusiasm, but at the same time with caution. He is constantly aware of the many problems and difficulties with which the subject still abounds; how hard it is, for example, to get at the Hellenic form of a town underlying the late Hellenistic and Roman remains, in spite of the tendency of streets to keep the same line for many centuries. The present reviewer is disinclined to take issue on small points, being gratified to find the author in agreement on almost all essential matters with views put forward more briefly and tentatively some years ago. This is particularly so when he says (p. 118): 'Les formes urbaines de la Grèce ne sont point empruntées à l'étranger, mais se sont dégagées de nécessités internes et de besoins propres à la vie des communautés grecques et à leur système d'organisation politique.'

THE TRIBUNES OF THE PEOPLE

JOCHEN BLEIKEN: *Das Volkstribunat der klassischen Republik*. (Zetemata, Heft 13.) Pp. xii+166. Munich: Beck, 1955. Paper, DM. 16.50.

THE tribunate, a 'potestas in seditione et ad seditionem nata', was in two periods of its history a revolutionary organ (during the Struggle of the Orders and again in the last century of the Republic), but for the intervening 150 years it existed as a legalized office of the State and its holders did not necessarily diverge from or clash with State policy. It is with this central period, which started when the *lex Hortensia* made resolutions of the plebeians binding on the whole community, that Bleiken is primarily concerned. In the first chapter he develops his views on the early growth of the powers of the tribunes. While denying that plebiscita had any legal validity before 287 B.C., he emphasizes that resolutions of the Concilium Plebis could form the basis of measures voted in the Comitia. He follows H. Siber and others in believing that the Licinian-Sextian rogations did not establish for the plebeians a legal right to one consulship every year, but only an expectation which became *mos* during the last third of the fourth century and law in 287 when tribunician *rogatio* first bound the whole community. Thus the *lex Hortensia* marked the most important stage in the development of the tribunes' power, but the disturbances that led up to its enactment were economic rather than political, arising from the demands of the peasants: at the settlement their leaders secured binding force for plebeian resolutions in order to protect them from similar wrongs in the future.

Thus by the end of the revolutionary period in 287 tribunes could take positive action in the interests of Rome as a whole, by virtue of their *rogatio* (together with the *ius senatus habendi*). They were in consequence approximating to ordinary magistrates but they lacked magisterial insignia (*fascēs, sella*, and *toga praetexta*) and, more important, they lacked *imperium* and *auspiciū* and had no clearly defined field of competence, no real *provincia* of the *Populus Romanus*. Thus they came to depend on others, and their initiative in both positive and negative actions might derive from the Senate, or magistrates, or even a coterie of nobles: as a result they helped to build up the predominance of the nobility. How this dependence developed is the main theme of Bleiken's study.

The transition from the early revolutionary period to the more tranquil days of the legalized tribunate is marked by occasional independent action, as seen in the careers of C. Flaminius and Terentius Varro, the subject of Bleiken's second chapter. He believes that the tribunate was used by the group of new plebeian leaders, who emerged from 241 onwards, as a means of achieving their ends against the ruling class. In showing how some of these new men were co-operating against the nobility in 217, he rejects any suggestion that the Aemilian-Scipionic faction may have been more favourable than the rest of the nobility to them; but, it may be noted, he mistakes my point of view (in *Roman Politics*) when he attributes to me the belief that Varro was an Aemilian-Scipionic candidate and that the Senate as a whole, having decided on a decisive battle, adopted Varro. Rather I suggested that the wishes of the People were so strong that the nobility could not prevent the election of Varro,

that the Aemilian-Scipionic group (who, no less than the People, wanted to risk a decisive engagement in 216) was eager to thwart Fabius and to get one of their men into the patrician consulship of 216, and that the relations of this group with some of these new men were less hostile than is sometimes supposed. In this connexion Bleiken might well have considered the arguments in favour of an earlier political link between Flaminius and the Aemilii, advanced by F. R. Kramer (*A.J.P.*, 1948, pp. 1 ff.), who suggests that Flaminius' measure of 232 was 'an integral part . . . of the foreign policy of the Aemilian consuls of this period' and attributes the ascendancy of the new men of the 230's to the machinations of the Aemilii. And far from suggesting (as Bleiken on p. 40 n. 1 implies that I do) that there was a lack of competent soldiers in the Senate in 216, I have specifically drawn attention to the experienced men then available (*Roman Politics*, p. 275). However, apart from the confused elections for 216, the main issue here is whether the new men could stand on their own feet with tribunician help against *all* the nobility (as Bleiken holds) or whether some of the nobles (through rivalry with others) were less hostile to this new group; and on this issue obviously different views may be held.

The needs of the Hannibalic War led tribunes to abandon any further attempts at real independence, and in three valuable chapters Bleiken traces in detail the way in which they placed their powers at the disposal of others. In legislation it is shown how they worked hand in glove with the Senate, which by controlling plebiscita and the plebeian assembly consolidated its dominant position (here was one of the *arcana imperii* of the nobles). An examination, *seriatim*, of the known plebiscita shows that the tribunes generally carried these in the interest of the Senate, or of magistrates (e.g. plebiscita *de rebus privatis* must often have derived from the initiative of a praetor) or of coteries of nobles (the two Scipiones Africani in particular made good use of tribunes). In the same way Bleiken examines the manner in which tribunes put their powers of *intercessio* and judicial control at the disposal of the whole state and of its *de facto* rulers. In this connexion he examines more fully the early judicial competence of the tribunes which he argues derived not from *coercitio* (as Mommsen) but from a right to bring political offences *nomine perduellionis* before the people. Thus, in general, official recognition of their competence in the State as a whole weakened rather than strengthened the tribunes; they did not attain to a guardianship of the State; and their rights were increasingly exercised in the sphere of administration, until Tiberius Gracchus once again took independent action in the political field. This work, clear and well-documented, is a valuable contribution to the study of Rome's constitutional development.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

THE COINAGE OF GALBA

C. M. KRAAY: *The Aes Coinage of Galba*. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 133.) Pp. x+125; 37 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$ 5.

THIS is the first attempt to apply to a significant portion of the Roman coinage the technique of die study which has produced such useful results in a number of series of Greek coins. The reign of Galba was chosen for this investigation

because its comparative brevity resulted in an *aes* coinage of manageable proportions and because the unusual variety of titles used by Galba on the coinage provided a further useful instrument in the laborious and painstaking task of distinguishing the various dies both of the obverse portraits and the reverse types and their interrelations. The investigation was limited to the bronze coinage since it, by its nature, is more likely to have survived in a representative quantity than the precious metal coinages, and the examination of dies was confined, for the greater part, to the sesterius coinage since its large flan made more easy the identification of die differences.

Dr. Kraay has assembled, within these limitations, a formidable body of material of which the catalogue, in meticulous detail, occupies half of the volume, while the plates illustrate the greater proportion of the dies which have been identified. The arrangement of any series of coinage which lacks specific marks indicating date and mint must be, to some extent, subjective. The results of a die study, such as that undertaken here, are factual and provide a firm basis for an objective arrangement of the series. For those familiar with the orderly pattern of Roman coinage in the later Empire the picture which emerges from this study of mint-organization under Galba is, to say the least, unexpected. There is order, but it is order rooted in disorder. Seven groups of die-linked groups, groups A to G, have been identified and from the interpretation of these blocks the erratic behaviour of the *aes* coinage of Galba is sketched.

The primary task in arranging a series of coins is the establishing of the chronology of such objective elements as do appear on the coins. Kraay discusses the successively acquired titles which appear on Galba's coins and divides the *aes* coinage into three periods: (1) with title *Augustus* only, from election of Galba by the Senate; (2) with *Caesar* added, from the date of the meeting between Galba and the Senate's deputation at Narbonne in July/August; (3) with *PM* added, by 22 December. This chronology, once established, is used only to determine the early and late dies in the linked sequences and not as a basic division in the coinage arrangement. Of the groups of linked coins Group D contains all those having *Augustus* only in the title, and sometime after the addition of *Caesar* two further groups B and C become active and are joined soon after by Group E. This last group ceases to function before the incorporation of *PM* into the title, while B and C stop shortly after beginning to use this title. Group G begins about the time E stops and continues until the death of Galba as the only active group at the mint in Rome; for group D, linked by a number of reverse dies to its continuation, group A, is, at this point, transferred from the mint of Rome. This group is said to be 'isolationist' in character differing from the others in the range of its reverse types and its portraiture. The inclusion, on some of the reverses, of the formula *R XL (quadragesima Galliarum remissa)* provides a suggestion that the transfer of this group was to a mint at Narbo in Gaul. F, a tiny group, is placed at Lugdunum.

That there are these die-linked groups is incontrovertible, but that they are, as Kraay maintains, the products of *officinae* which operate in an erratic fashion without analogy in the systems of the Roman coinage so far detected casts doubt on the interpretation of the facts derived from this study. The varieties of imperial title are taken to be the marks of the different *officinae*, whereas both from the period where *officina* is marked on the coin and earlier in the third century the distinguishing mark of the *officina* is the reverse type. This principle,

together with a regrouping of the die-linked blocks (for at some points the link is so tenuous that this can be done without unduly violating the linked groups), results in the creation of two distinct series distinguished by obverse inscriptions beginning (1) IMP, (2) SER. These move smoothly through the successive stages marked by the development of the imperial title producing in *aes* a fairly constant number of reverse types which repeat themselves in the first series and in the second subsequently develop new types. When the study of the coinage is extended from one denomination in *aes* to include the precious metals as well, an orderly pattern of *officinae* emerges based on reverses which follow a pattern similar to that of the *aes* and are in many cases reverses on an identical theme. The mint of the 'IMP' coins is clearly Rome. The silver and gold of the 'SER' series, both in content and stylistic characteristics, is Gallic, while the *aes*, though having its origins at Rome, also developed, as has been said above, into a Gallic production.

There is only one known and obvious mint for Roman coinage in Gaul in the early Empire, namely at Lugdunum. A previous objection to this attribution on the grounds that Lugdunum opposed Galba is unrealistic and Kraay's rejection in favour of Narbo because Lugdunum already has a coinage attributed to it—his series F—cannot be seriously regarded since that series consists of only some three coins.

One last important fact which emerges from this analysis of the coinage is the demonstration that the series of *aes* coins of Galba said to be posthumous issues in the reign of Vespasian must be issues in the reign of Galba himself. The proof lies in die sequences which link Galba's coins not only with Vespasian but with Vitellius as well.

British Museum

R. A. G. CARSON

FORM CRITICISM IN ROMAN LAW

DAVID DAUBE: *Forms of Roman Legislation*. Pp. 111. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 21s. net.

THIS is a most stimulating book, which can be recommended not merely to those whose concern is with Roman law but also to anyone who is interested in the forms and usages of the Latin language. Professor Daube here reminds us, not for the first time, of the advantages he derives from being versed both in Roman law and in biblical scholarship. For he is able to show how the technique of form criticism, already profitably applied to the latter field, may be used to bring some invigorating fresh air into the former. Law should indeed be a particularly fruitful field for this type of criticism since all lawyers, and the Roman lawyers as much as any, like to follow precedent in their modes of expression. In a little over a hundred pages Professor Daube gives some sixteen loosely connected illustrations of how form criticism can be applied to Roman legislation, with a few excursions into merely ethical precepts. 'Legislation' here includes the Praetorian and Aedilician edicts, which indeed provide some of the most interesting parts of the book. A reviewer is embarrassed with riches; he can only pick and choose. Some of the questions raised are: Why is *oportet* hardly ever found in legislation, and conversely why does it sometimes appear? Why does a lawgiver sometimes separate command and sanction and some-

times combine them ('this shall not be done; whoever disobeys shall be punished' as opposed to 'whoever does this shall be punished')? Why does the Praetor sometimes say *si quis . . . fecerit iudicium dabo* and sometimes *si quis fecisse dicetur . . .*? What is the explanation of the form *ne quis fecisse velit*? To what situations was the imperatival infinitive felt to be appropriate? What is the reason for the occasional future imperatives in *senatusconsulta* and, even more surprisingly, in the Aedilician edict? What is the explanation of the apparent change of grammatical subject in some early enactments (e.g. the opening passage of the XII Tables)?

Many of the answers to these and other questions must inevitably be largely guesswork, and each reader will make his own estimate of the plausibility of the guesswork. For example, there is an ingenious conjecture as to the origin of the future imperatives in the Aedilician edicts on the sale of slaves and *iumenta*. This form, habitual in statutes, is certainly surprising here. Daube points out, however, that it is also found in the treatises on husbandry (Cato, Columella), and indicates some particular similarities. Here then the Aediles adopted the form and perhaps the substance of the precepts of such treatises, merely adding to them a legal sanction. If, however, one accepts, as Daube does, the common view that the edict on slaves was in existence in the lifetime of Plautus, it would seem to follow that there was already then a literature on such questions sufficiently established for a borrowing of form by the Aediles to be natural, although the taking of the same form direct from statutes would be impossible. This does not seem very likely, but Daube makes the difficulty much greater by conjecturing that Cato both originated the literature and prompted the transplanting of its style to the edict—and all by 199 (the year of his aedileship) when he was 35.

Explanations in terms of the legislator's state of mind seem sometimes too vague and subjective to be reliable. Thus as to *si quis fecisse dicetur* and *si quis fecerit*, one would expect the Praetor to use the former, and more often than not he does, but sometimes he uses the latter, which is appropriate to statutes. Its use therefore, says Daube, betrays a 'legislative attitude'. But why should a more legislative attitude appear in the edict on *depositum* (*quod . . . depositum erit*) than in that on *commodatum* (*quod quis commodasse dicetur*) or in the edict *de hominibus armatis*, where the *dicetur* form is meticulously observed? Again, Daube has a very interesting discussion of the separation of command and sanction. A separate command is absurd where the rule is obvious or well-established. (This leads him to support Mommsen in excluding *ito* in the reconstruction of the corrupt first sentence of the XII Tables, *si in ius vocat [ito]*.) This explanation works well in some cases, but it is difficult to see why *ne quis eum qui in ius vocabitur vi eximat . . .* is any newer or more unexpected than many other sections of the Praetor's edict.

But it is much easier to snipe at some of the answers proposed than to find better ones oneself, and the questions are undeniably worth asking. The interest of the book lies in its ability to make even the most sceptical critic look at the texts with new eyes. A section which the reviewer found particularly instructive was that dealing with the question, already mentioned, of *oportet*. By giving to the word the sense of 'there is a duty' we make, says Daube, unnecessary difficulties. The basic meaning is rather 'it is proper according to some higher authority'. The implication of a higher authority explains why the word is foreign to the edict, since Praetorian rules can claim no higher authority; and

similarly in statutes it is found only in those dealing with sacral law, that is, which state the law rather than make it. More novel (because the reference to a higher authority is implicit also in 'duty') and more important is the rendering 'it is proper'. This can refer to rights as well as to duties, and makes it possible to explain the *formula* of the *actio Publiciana* (*si . . . eum hominem eius esse oporteret*) which has hitherto had to be forced into the straitjacket of duty, and to exempt Gaius from the suspicion of quaintness when he says (iii. 180) *debitorem . . . post litem contestatam condemnari oportere*. It also makes sense of, for example, *quaque ex quaque lege . . . Augustum . . . facere oportuit* in the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani*.

It need hardly be said that the book is a delight to read—learning is borne lightly and with wit. It is to be hoped that Daube will treat us to more.

Brasenose College, Oxford

BARRY NICHOLAS

ANTIOCH

PAUL PETIT: *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche au IV^e siècle après J.C.* (Institut français d'archéologie de Beyrouth, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, lxii.) Pp. 446. Paris, 1955. Paper.

THIS is a full-scale discussion of the life of Antioch in the fourth century A.D. in all its aspects, so far as they are illuminated by the works of Libanius. M. Petit is well qualified for the task which he has undertaken. He knows his Libanius backwards, both the speeches and the letters, and the abundant modern literature upon them. He has, moreover, a sound understanding of the background, political, social, and economic, based on a wide reading in the ancient sources (including the voluminous works of John Chrysostom) and in the modern literature.

If some chapters are rather unsatisfying the fault lies not with M. Petit, but with Libanius, whose allusive style and abhorrence of technical terms make him a very bad witness where hard facts are required. On the whole M. Petit has successfully resisted the temptation to squeeze more information out of Libanius' vague phrases than they contain, and is rightly content on some topics to register a nil return. He is perhaps too prone to statistical analysis of material which is too limited in scope and uncertain in interpretation to bear such treatment. He himself, it is true, carefully warns the reader of the tenuous character of the material, but there is a danger that future historians will quote the percentages of decurions who became lawyers or officials in the reigns of Constantius II and Theodosius I, without remarking that these percentages are based on perhaps a dozen cases, and that among these cases there are many where the essential facts are uncertain. M. Petit sometimes in his search for material accepts too readily Seeck's often highly imaginative inferences. He confidently, for instance, calls Eusebius XII the *castrensis* on Seeck's authority. The allusions to him in Libanius prove only that he held some post in the *comitatus*; the post cannot have been that of *castrensis*, which was held by a eunuch of the bedchamber, whereas Eusebius was a former pupil of Libanius.

On some minor points M. Petit draws illegitimate inferences from Libanius' allusions. He infers from *Or.* i. 234, xlviii. 26. *Ep.* 857–60, 916 that Tatian

issued
had 1
where
περι τ
λέγει
858
sary t
conn
for pr
revok
by V
A
civic
ment
resum
Liban
free c
'the
M. P
civic
to est
probl
civic
city,
forme
passa
ing n
but a
very
and
κληρο
the M
a tra
mean
most
had
impe
M
impe
land,
And
keep
civic
the p
that
confi
impe
them
Th
unde

issued a law forbidding advocates to practise unless after a fixed period they had received a legal training. The only significant references are *Ep.* 857, where Diognetus, an experienced barrister, has been compelled νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τοῦ χρόνου σιγᾶν, and *Ep.* 916, where Libanius wrote a speech urging δὲ λέγειν ἐξείναι τοῖς δυναμένοις λέγειν against τοῦ κωλύοντος νόμου λέγειν. In *Ep.* 858 he praises Diognetus for having proved by his career that it was not necessary to go to Berytus to be a successful barrister, but there is no reason to connect this remark with the law, which apparently only fixed a time limit for practice at the bar. Such a law, imposing *silentium* after twenty years, was revoked by Theod. *Nov.* x. 2 (439) in the East, and is alluded to in the West by Val. *Nov.* ii. 2 (442) and 4 (454).

A more difficult problem is the confiscation by the imperial government of civic lands. It is recorded by many sources that Julian restored their endowments to the cities, and that under Valentinian and Valens they had been resumed by the state. In the *pro Rhetoribus* (*Or.* xxxi. 16), written in 354-5, Libanius states that there were many civic estates, great and small, at the free disposal of the council at Antioch. In *Or.* l. 5, written in 388, he says that 'the city has estates, given to the city in their wills by men of times past'. M. Petit also cites *Or.* xviii. 195 and lxviii. 3 as evidence that Antioch owned civic estates between these two dates. These passages are irrelevant, referring to estates of decurions, but even if they are eliminated from the argument, the problem remains. M. Petit endeavours to solve it by postulating two classes of civic lands at Antioch, those with which Seleucus had originally endowed the city, and those which had subsequently been bequeathed or given to it: the former, but not the latter, he argues, were confiscated. His theory turns on a passage in Julian's *Misopogon* (362 c) where he reproaches Antioch for providing no sacrifice for its patron god, though no village on the frontiers of Pontus but a great city *μυρίους κλήρους γῆς ἰδίας κεκτημένη*. M. Petit translates this very literally, as owning (corporately) 10,000 lots (exactly) of land of its own, and infers (following Bickermann) that this endowment of precisely 10,000 κλήροι must have been made at the city's foundation. But in another passage in the *Misopogon* (370 d) Julian clearly, as M. Petit admits, uses γῆς κλήροι as a translation of *iuga*, and it would seem likely that the phrase bears the same meaning here, in which case the hypothetical Seleucid κλήροι disappear. The most natural interpretation of the passage is that Antioch was a great city which had a large territory, comprising thousands of *iuga* of private (as opposed to imperial) land.

M. Petit's theory involves many other difficulties. Is it conceivable that the imperial government investigated in every city the title of every piece of civic land, and is it likely that in most cases the original title would be known? And what of cities which were not Seleucid royal foundations? Did they keep all their lands? A simpler explanation of the problem would be that the civic lands were confiscated late in the reign of Constantius II, and were still in the possession of the city when the *pro Rhetoribus* was written in 354-5; and that by 388 the city had acquired some new lands by bequests. The act of confiscation affected only lands then in the possession of the cities, and the imperial government not only permitted bequests to them, but allocated to them the estates of intestate decurions.

These are only very minor blemishes on a work which adds greatly to our understanding of the fourth century. On a number of important points M.

Petit convincingly corrects generally accepted misconceptions. He demonstrates, for instance, that civic patriotism was by no means dead even at the end of the fourth century, but that there were still decurions who felt it to be their duty and their pride to spend lavishly on their liturgies. He proves, too, that in the East urban life did not decay, and that there was no movement of the aristocracy from the towns to country villas. The work is more than a local study of Antioch. It is a valuable contribution to the social history of the later Roman empire.

Jesus College, Cambridge

A. H. M. JONES

SHORT REVIEWS

BRUNO SNELL, ULRICH FLEISCHER, HANS JOACHIM METTE: *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. 2. Lieferung (ἀεικὴς-αἰπέω). Pp. 96. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1956. Paper, DM. 24.

THE first instalment of the great Hamburg lexicon to early Greek epic appeared early in 1955, and was welcomed in this *Review* for March 1956 (N.S. vi. 8-9); there is therefore no need to repeat the descriptions which were there given. The second instalment follows the same lines as the first; the only changes are that Dr. Fleischer now joins Professor Snell and Dr. Mette in the editorship, and that a list of articles recently published in connexion with the work of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* is printed inside the front cover. Further acquaintance with this lexicon as a working tool goes far to confirm the favourable impression created by the first instalment. The fullness and accuracy of the articles make the lexicon invaluable to those who have the time and patience to study the information which it provides; but even in this deserved praise *surgit amari aliquid*—it will be seen that in 176 pages, or just under one-fourteenth of the projected length of the lexicon (about 2,400 pages), we have barely reached αἰπέω (about one-fiftieth of the way to αῖψ if Liddell and Scott are reliable guides), and the journey has taken fifteen months. At this rate, we shall be lucky if even the longest-lived among us ever have the good fortune to see the lexicon completed. It is to be hoped that the various claims of compilation, printing, proof-reading, and (above all) finance can be so reconciled that future instalments will appear at intervals shorter than that which has separated the first and second. We need this lexicon badly, and the

work in it is too good to be left in any danger of losing its value through delay in publication.

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

GEORGE DEF. LORD: *Homeric Renaissance; the Odyssey of George Chapman*. Pp. 224. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Chatto & Windus), 1956. Cloth, 18s. net.

THE position of Chapman's translations of Homer as classics of English literature is secured against the ephemeral snobberies of critical taste by Keats's sonnet; but I doubt if any reputable Homeric scholar has ever taken them seriously as contributions to the understanding of the poems. Mr. Lord, who is an Assistant Professor of English at Yale, seeks to maintain that Chapman understood the real meaning of the *Odyssey*, which he interpreted as a 'dynamic allegory', illustrating man's progress from sensuality and error to true wisdom. In the process Lord abundantly documents Chapman's very slight knowledge of Greek, and his dependence upon Scapula and Spondanus; but at the same time he argues that many of Chapman's notorious 'expansions' of Homer's text and some at least of his errors in translation were intentional, and can be accounted for by his allegorical purpose.

I found Lord's discussions of the allegorizing tendencies of Chapman and his contemporaries and of Chapman's style, and his comparison of Chapman and Pope, both interesting and instructive; but it would need an expert in this branch of English literature to judge them properly. On the other hand, Lord's case for the correctness of

Chapman hardly out the very ear is no p qualifie vince rightly he so a Lord h the tasi indeed Homer amateu an igno surpris lated M a Jack scholar tion of (though and of such as German Seck,

Univers

JOSEPH Metho cratic Heft Steine

This d has sin Festug tract v discuss detail. in refer 1952, tract u the tra an emy Festug authoro spectat rical a points view M sugges thesis relatio is thu Festug in holi to that

Chapman's interpretation of the *Odyssey* hardly needs refutation. Lord fairly points out that the allegorizing of Homer began very early; but the antiquity of the practice is no proof of its respectability, and even a qualified person would find it hard to convince students of Homer that Chapman rightly assessed the meaning of a work which he so shockingly mistranslated. In any case Lord has not the necessary qualifications for the task which he has set himself. He claims indeed that he has 'tried to make full use of Homeric studies, within my limitations as an amateur' (p. 9); but his limitations include an ignorance of Greek so profound that he is surprised that Chapman should have translated *λύσασθαι* by 'redeem'd' (p. 115), and a lack of acquaintance with Odyssean scholarship which leads him to omit all mention of Andrew Lang, even as a translator (though the list on p. 15 includes Butcher), and of W. J. Woodhouse, to say nothing of such authorities as V. Bérard, Bethé, Focke, Germain, Merkelbach, Rothe, Schwartz, Seeck, von der Mühl, and Wilamowitz.

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

JOSEF-HANS KÜHN: *System- und Methodenprobleme im Corpus Hippocraticum*. (Hermes, Einzelschriften, Heft 11.) Pp. 106. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956. Paper.

THIS dissertation was completed in 1949 but has since been revised to take account of Festugière's edition of *De prisca medicina*, the tract which forms the basis of most of the discussion and which is here analysed in detail. A lengthy section has also been added in refutation of H. Diller's theory (*Hermes*, 1952, pp. 385 ff.) of the dependence of this tract upon Plato. Kühn refuses to see here the transposition of Plato's 'rationalism' to an empirical plane, and, in agreement with Festugière, gives the priority to the medical author. Plato is seen rather as the interested spectator of the dispute between the empirical and the 'rational-speculative' standpoints in the sphere of medicine; in Kühn's view he gleaned from that dispute many suggestions leading to the method of hypothesis and of collection and division. The relation between *De prisca medicina* and Plato is thus represented as much closer than Festugière would admit, though both agree in holding that Plato's point of view is akin to that of the physicians attacked in this tract,

the author of which is thought by Kühn to have been influenced by Protagoras in spite of the (in my judgement, sound) arguments of Festugière (p. 59, misprinted as 95 by Kühn, p. 29); slight verbal resemblances, as on *αἰσθησις* as the only *μέτρον*, between authors dealing with different problems ought not to be pressed. Kühn is perhaps too anxious to attribute a thoroughgoing relativism and sensationalism to this tract, as well as a rigid empiricism which would make impossible any *τέχνη*, including the art of medicine for whose 'reality' the author contends. Hence the empiricist is accused of inconsistency by Kühn when he is found assuming 'hypotheses' of his own, aiming at an ever more extensive *ἀκρίβεια*, and contending for a systematization of experience which could not be justified by observation alone without 'principle' and 'method'. The point is rather that the author of *De prisca medicina* regards other people's postulates, particularly the fancies of the 'talkers about nature', as over-simplified and (unlike his own) irrelevant to medicine because insufficiently founded upon observation. In fact Kühn's opposition between empirical and rational is too nearly absolute to have ever been actually held by any theorist on these matters.

In the second part the attitude of *De prisca medicina* is contrasted with the differing but related dogmatisms, on the nature of man and the cause of disease, found in *De flat.*, *De carn.*, *De nat. hom.*, and *De victu*. Kühn is willing to reconstruct from the 'parallelism' of rhetoric and medicine in Plato's *Phaedrus* the theories of Hippocrates himself on 'meteorology' and the relation of the cosmos and its elements to the human body. Hackforth, *Plato's Phaedrus*, p. 151, would suggest some caution in this enterprise; and his remarks on *τοῦ ὄλου* in 270 c would also have assisted Kühn's discussion of this difficult point. Kühn concludes that Plato is on the side of Hippocrates and Hippocrates on the side of the medical 'rationalists' attacked by *De prisca medicina*, and that Hippocrates' own views are not represented by any of the extant Hippocratic treatises; in particular, Menon made a mistake in attributing to Hippocrates the doctrine of *De flat.* that diseases have only one cause, the *pneuma*.

But even if at times the evidence is capable of quite other interpretations, Kühn has done good service in bringing out the controversies which underlie certain recurrent words, themes, and allusions in the Hippocratic Corpus.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

PHILIP VELLACOTT: *Aeschylus, The Oresteian Trilogy*. A New Translation. Pp. 201. West Drayton; Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

MR. VELLACOTT's translation was commissioned by the B.B.C., and his use of rhyme to give formality in the choruses justified itself in performance, even though the movement rather suggests the ballad. But the main point of the 'iambic hexameters' of the dialogue seems to be that they are not blank verse. The whole is an honest and unpretentious effort to let Aeschylus speak for himself in English which is necessarily a good deal plainer than his own Greek.

The Introduction in thirty highly compressed pages ranges back to the origins of Greek religion. It is very uncertain whether Apollo's pro-Persian leanings had any relevance to his claim to be the mouth-piece of Zeus and the audience's response to it. It may well be that the curse of Thyestes had a connexion with the decision to sacrifice Iphigenia, but it should not be stated as an undisputed fact, and still less should 'the curse revived and took control' be smuggled into the translation of line 223. That Agamemnon arrogantly allowed heaven a share of his glory is the 'likely interpretation of 810 ff. Nor should he be said that he 'snubs his wife'; the emotions touched by snubs have no place in this world. To say that 'the temple façade was rolled aside' suggests machinery unlikely to have existed in this, and perhaps in any other, Greek theatre. But some of these are points of detail, and this is a valuable addition to the Penguin translations.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

G. R. LEVY: *Plato in Sicily*. Pp. 161; 1 plate, 2 maps, 2 diagrams. London: Faber, 1956. Cloth, 15s. net.

ROGER GODEL: *Platon à Héliopolis d'Égypte*. Post-face de François Dautas. Pp. 83. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper.

MISS LEVY's attractive book presents an imaginative reconstruction of Plato's life from his first visit to Sicily until his death. It is not, as the title might suggest, confined to events in Sicily themselves, although naturally the interest throughout is centred upon the extraordinary story of the relationship between Plato and Dion. The first task of an author who undertakes such a theme is

simply to tell the story, and this is done in an eminently satisfying manner. Moreover, Miss Levy has read and pondered all the information preserved in ancient writers and is justified in her claim that 'there is no event described which is not suggested by some ancient authority'. The story is all the better because there is no underlying thesis to be argued. We are left to conjecture for ourselves how Plato could be at the same time so wise and so foolish. The character of Dionysius II is pictured much as Plato must have seen it, and we are left with something of the same bewilderment which Plato clearly felt. A few detailed points may be mentioned. It seems unlikely that Plato's real name was Aristocles. The first meeting of Plato and Dion in the home of Archytas at Tarentum seems contrary to the evidence of Plutarch and is perhaps inherently unlikely as well. The picture of Plato proceeding alone on foot up Aetna with a horse to carry thick cloaks and instruments is a rather surprising one. On the other hand, Miss Levy may well be right in supposing, as against a number of recent writers, that Dionysius I was directly responsible for the attempt to sell Plato into slavery on his return from the first visit to Sicily.

Dr. Godel has less ancient evidence and so a much freer hand in his reconstruction of Plato's visit to Egypt. The tradition that Plato did visit Egypt comes from his pupil Hermodorus and is likely to be true. Godel would also accept the evidence of Strabo that Plato and Eudoxus spent three years at Heliopolis while in Egypt. Strabo actually says thirteen years, which seems incredible, and three years is only a little less difficult to believe, as even this amounts to something like permanent residence in Egypt. On the other hand, it should perhaps be said that the late Professor Hackforth was prepared to entertain a similar tradition that Plato and Simmias were fellow-students of philosophy at Memphis near by (*Plato's Phaedo*, pp. 13-14). However that may be, Godel presents a prolonged 'philosophic meditation' in which he describes how Plato may have learnt the traditions of the Egyptians preserved from the time of Imhotep in the 'University' of Heliopolis. These traditions he regularly characterizes as metaphysical, though mystical and religious would probably have been better terms to apply to them. Much of the information given about Egyptian beliefs will be both interesting and unfamiliar to classical students, and this part of the book is well worth reading. But there follows a fanciful attempt to equate Platonism with Egyptian metaphysics in terms of vertical and hori-

zontal lines with intermediate vectors, which might well have been omitted.

G. B. KERFERD

University College, Swansea

PAUL TURNER: Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*. A new translation with an introduction. Pp. 125. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

THREE English translations of Longus have already appeared since 1900, but none of them can be considered wholly satisfactory. This, the fourth, besides being readable, is mostly accurate—unlike Lindsay's; it treats the work with an objectivity lacking in Moore; and is complete (which Lowe's is not) without offending our taste. Does it present to the English reader a just impression of the Greek work?

All translators must make some sacrifice. Turner openly states what this is in his case, and gives his reasons: 'What I have doubtless failed to suggest is its poetry; but this may have its advantages, for "poetical" prose is rather liable to obscure the content, and it is important that no veil of language should prevent the modern reader from realizing how humorous and matter-of-fact a storyteller Longus is.' Here he draws attention to a side of Longus too often neglected; and his translation is on this score excellent. But there is a danger of going too far in reacting from pseudo-Elizabethan English. There is besides its urbanity a poetic theme which is essential to *Daphnis and Chloe*; so that of some passages it is lack of poetry in the rendering which may obscure the content. The *τόποι* of Longus, unlike those of most Greek novelists, are not mere accretions, but integral to this theme: likewise the pastoral convention itself; and the translator can only transmit what Turner himself calls 'the intensity of the appeal it makes to our imagination' by admitting occasional elevations of style. The descriptions of spring (i. 9) and of nature in general; of the love-apple (iii. 33); the language of a god in a vision (e.g. ii. 27); require different treatment from the realistic bluntness of the Methymnean youths (ii. 15); Gnathon's rhetorical posies (iv. 17); or the factual account of Chloe's wooing (iii. 25).

It is perhaps this ubiquitous plainness in Turner's style which makes his translation seem slightly flat. He warns us that this is not a novel in our sense; but if all of it is rendered in colloquial English we are made impossibly

conscious of its conventionalisms and artificialities, and so led to irrelevant comparisons with our own novels. Flatness also arises from the fact that Longus' simplicity rarely survives literal translation (e.g. the opening of the *φάρτα* legend, i. 27): still less his rhetorical figures—particularly his favourite triplets (e.g. the opening of Lamon's lament, iv. 8). Probably greater freedom with the structure of sentences or groups of sentences would have been justified (here Moore gives a lead): excess of 'for' and 'well' betray the translator.

The book is well printed and the inclusion of chapter numbers is welcome: but there is a danger of the notes' being overlooked. The introduction is entirely suitable.

H. H. O. CHALK

University of Glasgow

MARCEL RICHARD: *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt: accedunt aliquot homiliae anonymae*. Pp. xxxiv+273. Oslo: Brøgger, 1956. Paper.

ASTERIUS, the Cappadocian rhetor and advocate, is a figure familiar to theologians as an important exponent of 'Arian' theology at the time of the council of Nicaea. This volume contains the long and eagerly awaited edition of his lecture-sermons—or rather of substantial extracts from them (unhappily not a single item can be regarded as quite complete), together with a few by other unknown writers of rather later date which are conjoined with those of Asterius in the manuscript tradition. To many readers of this journal no doubt the prime interest of the sermons will lie in the specimens they offer of Constantinian pulpit oratory, the formal stylistic features of which are not startlingly different from those of the secular oration of the period; the commonplaces of the latter could be turned to an edifying purpose (cf. xxi. 10 on the Seven Ages of Man). The pulpiteer in Asterius is not tiresome or merely artificial, exuberant as his manner may be. He has something to say (more than can be claimed for some of his contemporaries) and says it with all the skill at his command. The technique of the schools is baptized into Christ. For the student of cultural and legal history there are some interesting allusions, e.g. in xxii where Asterius remarks that a man who tears up an imperial *sacra* is liable to death on the charge of *laesa maiestas* (is not this among the earliest instances of *σάκρα* used absolutely?) and that

the uniform of a gravely offending soldier was burnt instead of the offender. This has been interestingly discussed by L. Wenger, 'Strafweise Verbrennung des Mantels statt des Mannes', in *Anzeiger d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1947, pp. 293-9, and by Skard in *Symb. Ostl.* xxvii (1949), p. 62, who compares Ps.-Dio Chrysostom (= Favorinus?), xxxvii. 45-46.

One passage is important for the historian. It is well known that during the Great Persecution Asterius lapsed. Athanasius unkindly speaks of him as *ἡ δὲ θύρα* (*Decc.* 8) and as that *πολυκέφαλος σοφιστής* (*Syn.* 18) who on account of his lapse could not be ordained. An autobiographical passage in xvii. 2 relates how 'when I came into Christ's vineyard I was prevented from labouring by bodily weakness, but by the zeal of great husbandmen and wise teachers was aroused to tread the winepress'. This confirms the accuracy of the statement of Philostorgius, *H.E.* ii. 14 (p. 25 Bidez), that after his lapse Asterius was restored through the exhortations of the martyred scholar Lucian of Antioch.

But the theologian reaps the richest harvest from these texts, e.g. for the history of infant baptism (xii. 4, xxi. 10, xxvii. 2) or relics (xxviii. 2-3) or the ceremonies of the Paschal baptism (xi) or the relating of the Atonement to divine impassibility (xxii. 3, xxxi. 2). The influence of Origen is marked: for 'atheistic polytheism' (ii. 14, xxv. 13) cf. *Orig. c. Cels.* i. 1, iii. 73; divine wrath is remedial (xii. 11-12, xix. 32); numerology (xii, xx) and psalm-titles (xiii. 1, xxi. 3) are important for exegesis; Christ's descent from heaven is not spatial (xxv. 25); sin is the consequence of diabolical co-operation with the will's inclination (xiii. 18, cf. *Orig. de Princ.* iii. 2. 1 ff.); Old Testament sacrifice is on a par with pagan cult (xi. 5—cf. *Orig. Hom. Num.* xvii. 1), etc. The allusion to the Hebrew text of Ps. 109 (110). 3 which puzzles the editor at xviii. 15 is paralleled in *Orig. in Luc.* p. 44 Rauer. The editing is throughout distinguished and scrupulous, and the Danish printing a delight to sore eyes (breathings inverted at p. 17. 9; p. 89. 26; p. 160. 17).

H. CHADWICK

Queens' College, Cambridge

ÉDOUARD DES PLACES: *Diadoque de Photice, Œuvres spirituelles*. (Sources Chrétiennes, no. 5 bis.) Pp. 206. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1955. Stiff paper.

A good introduction and sufficient commentary accompany this critical edition and

translation of the complete works (with one dubious piece called a *Catechesis*) of Diadochus, the cultivated bishop of Photice in Old Epirus in the mid-fifth century. The main work, *de Perfectione Spirituali* (earlier editions by Popov, 1903, and Weis-Liebersdorf, Teubner, 1912, from fewer manuscripts than des Places), illustrates the familiar themes of Greek mystical theology of the period—the conflict with the devil and desire, how to distinguish divine from diabolical dreams, the perils of pride in fasting, abstinence from food, drink (especially aperitifs), and baths, the five spiritual senses, etc. It also contains strong polemic against the heretical Mes-salians, not least because Diadochus has more than a little in common with them. The book also includes a brief Sermon for Ascensiontide and a dialogue entitled *Vision*, comparable in form to the *Hermetica*. Photius' statement that Diadochus defended Chalcedon against the monophysites is borne out not only by the Sermon (where it is explicit and is noted by the editor) but by the startlingly diphyssite implications of *Vis.* 28. With *de Perf. Sp.* 44 (all food and drink is good, but abstinence is 'more gnostic') cf. Sextus Pythag. *Sent.* 109; with *ibid.* 53 (when ill, send for the physicians, but trust Christ rather than them to heal you), cf. Origen, *c. Cels.* viii. 61.

H. CHADWICK

Queens' College, Cambridge

JOHN MAVROGORDATO: *Digenes Akrites*. Edited with an introduction, translation, and commentary. Pp. lxxxiv+273. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 45s. net.

PROFESSOR MAVROGORDATO's long-awaited work on the remarkable Byzantine epic romance of Digenes Akritas is very welcome, not only for the excellent line-for-line translation that he provides, but also for his wise and entertaining commentary on the history of the poem and the meaning that various scholars have read into it. Of the five metrical manuscripts of the poem he has chosen, for reasons that are convincing, that from Grottaferrata as being the oldest extant, rejecting the theory put forward by Grégoire that the Russian prose version represents the original more closely. Mavrogordato shows that the resemblance of the Russian version to the Akritic songs is due to the fact that both are the result of oral transmission. He dates the poem as we have it now as having been written in the middle of the eleventh century; and while he accepts the argument,

first put
develop
backgro
memor
ninth c
attemp
inciden
tion is
ment a
of the
poetry.

The
gramm
to the
the wh
vour o
of Eng
sense a
bathos
whethe
and th
the tra
to the
wife' f
heroine
'the gi
precio
symbol
the G
portan
remari
genitiu

KAR
kezde
Akad
THIS
literat
Home
its sub
is con
logical
which
accom
ingful
Greek
hexam
pace A
of a hi
the or
sidered
intelle
pre-li
which
and in
with
ing to
and w

first put forward by Sathas and Legrand and developed by Grégoire, that the historical background of the poem is provided by memories of the Paulician rebellions of the ninth century, he is critical of Grégoire's attempt to read too much history into its incidents. Mavrogordato's whole introduction is admirable for the sanity of his judgement and the understanding that he shows of the interrelation of history and popular poetry.

The poem is not easy to translate. Its grammar and style vary from the Homeric to the demotic. Mavrogordato has tried, on the whole successfully, to bring out the flavour of the original language by his choice of English words, keeping literally to the sense and not shunning bathos where there is bathos in the text. It may be questioned whether the flashes of real poetry which now and then illuminate the original appear in the translation, which, indeed, perhaps adds to the bathos by such renderings as 'my good wife' for *ἡ καλή μου*, and by calling the heroine, who is always referred to as *ἡ κόρη*, 'the girl'. 'The maiden' might sound a little precious but it would better convey the symbolic idea that is apparently intended by the Greek word. Such criticisms are unimportant. The translation as a whole is a remarkable example of scholarship and ingenuity.

STEVEN RUNCIMAN

and the Sirens, who are treated in general agreement with Buschor (cf. Pollard in *C.R.*, 1952, p. 60). The traditions regarding Orpheus and the story of the Argonauts are found to be of some significance; even Plato on 'divine madness' is pressed into service. The conclusion is that in the pre-Homeric stage all songs were incantations: the poet was a medicine-man with a technique for inducing a state of possession, and 'inspiration' was no empty metaphor. This magico-religious tone survives in Hesiod and in choral lyric, whereas Homer stands for a new secularizing tendency. Marót does not wish to impose any *a-priori* theory of development upon the history of Greek literature. But his view that there was a clear division between the religious and the non-religious (Homeric) epic does not seem to be borne out by the facts. The weakness of the theory appears in the insistence that Homer was a sudden and 'unprepared' phenomenon not connected logically with what preceded him. One can understand why Marót views with some disfavour the work of Pestalozzi and Schadewaldt. Marót is well acquainted with the relevant literature; a short excursus in German—hardly full enough to be called a summary—provides some help to the reader who lacks Hungarian.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

KÁROLY MARÓT: *A görög irodalom kezdetei*. Pp. 376: 12 plates. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1956. Cloth, 50 f.

THIS book on 'the beginnings of Greek literature' investigates in particular the pre-Homeric stage of development. It approaches its subject from two directions. Firstly, there is considerable speculation on the psychological and physiological conditions from which arose first the dance with its vocal accompaniment, and thereafter more meaningful kinds of rhythmic noise. The primitive Greek rhythm, it is held, was the dactylic hexameter, or something very like it, but, *pace* Aristotle, all early poetry was primarily of a highly lyrical tone. Aristotle's theories on the origin of poetry and its genres are considered at some length and rejected as too intellectualizing. Secondly, pointers to the pre-literary situation are sought in survivals which may be found in recorded folk-lore, and in hints drawn from the poets, beginning with Hesiod's account of the Muses. According to Marót the Muses were water-sprites and workers of magic, as also were the Graces

The Poems of Catullus, translated and with an introduction by HORACE GREGORY. Pp. xxiv+184. London: Thames & Hudson, 1956. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

As a verse translation of the opening lines of poem 61 Mr. Gregory, who is an American poet, offers this: 'On that hill (O Helicon / where the muses gather) / there the son of all the vast planetary systems / walks in eternal splendour / giving blossoming girls away / to young men striding homeward / . . . Wreath the sweet marjoram / blooming through the shadows / of the golden wedding veil around your head, O virgin, / come to us revealing (in fatal / golden slippers) feet / more beautiful than snow / fallen in the sunlight.' For 36. 11-15 he has 'O Venus, sprung from divine blue oceans, / who walks through holy Cyprus, who travels wind-swept Urii, / who lives in her Ancona, within her sacred temple, / or where reeds grow in Cnidus, in . . . mathus, in Golgi, / or in Dyrrachium, the seaport where men gather / from all of Sicily'; for 45. 17-20 'Love sneezed again and they received his own, his

sacred blessing. / Under his wings, they marched forth, love for love, united, / blood fused in a rich liquid'; for 84. 1-2 'Arrius, when he tries to speak of Justice, says the word / with so much stress on the first letter that the syllables are murdered, no justice on his lips'.

The introduction reveals that Catullus was 'the second son of a wealthy army contractor', that his brother 'died on a diplomatic mission to Asia Minor', that among his friends was 'Cornelius the soldier', that Clodia was 'nearly five years older than Catullus', that 'Julius Caesar, as he could well afford to do, outcharmed Catullus' (whatever that means). Of Valerius Cato it tells us that he 'carried the torch of Greek studies into the provinces of Rome', of Burns that he owed a 'great debt to his near contemporary, James Fergusson', of the translator himself that Ezra Pound and D. H. Lawrence 'served the great purpose of leading' him 'away from nineteenth-century "class-room" standards'.

C. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow

HENRY BARDON: *La Littérature latine inconnue*. Tome ii: *L'Époque impériale*. Pp. 340. Paris: Klincksieck, 1956. Paper, 1,800 fr.

THE reader who sees in the index of this book the names of such Latin authors as Dorcatius and Derculo, Navigius and Toxotius, Pal-furius Sura and Urseius Ferox, and is depressed by the thought that he knows nothing about them, will be comforted when he looks at the text and finds that there is nothing to know. The Empire can supply the names of writers, and presumed writers, who are nothing more than names in even greater profusion than the Republic. M. Bardon has collected them all out of their 'ténèbres accablantes' and has patiently worked them into his text, but, alas, he often leaves us little wiser for his pains. He gives us, for example, a catalogue of a score of persons who are mentioned as orators by Pliny and Martial (pp. 198-9), but it is hard to see how such a list of mere names can add much, or anything, to our picture of the time, which it is his laudable object to enlarge and vivify.

As in M. Bardon's earlier volume (*C.R.* lxxviii. 129), there is a great deal of useful information; there are interesting pieces of criticism and happy turns of phrase, which consort curiously with naïve reflections like 'Heureuse époque, où les querelles littéraires passionnaient!' (p. 153, of attacks on Cicero

and counterblasts to them) or 'Persuadons-nous que le poète était médiocre: nous nous éviterons des regrets' (p. 76). And there are the same defects. One is a tendency to extravagance. On a work of Varius from which we possess four fragments, amounting to a dozen lines in all, we have 'Synthèse d'Ennius et de Lucrèce sous l'égide de Catulle . . . l'énergie dense de la forme annonce Lucaïn, et la splendeur colorée, Virgile' (p. 30); on a phrase in the *Commentarii* of Augustus, 'l'expression *animam inter deorum immortalium numina* a une ampleur qui répond à l'idée et à l'intention' (p. 100). The other is a distressing number of blemishes in scholarship. P. 61: in Ovid, *Pont.* iv. 16. 5, M. Bardon proposes to read *Troezen* as an accusative (and appears to be unaware that *Troezena* was proposed long ago). P. 71: he cites without comment Alfonsi's reading *atque alium liberis* ('des hommes libres') *intactum quaerimus orbem*. P. 80: he says 'la clausule héroïque *pōllicēbāntūr* n'est pas surprenante'; on a sentence of Pollio ending *testamentum reprehendimus* he notes 'l'absence de rythme' and adds 'les clausules sont négligées'. P. 134: he says of Bassus fr. 2 '*Coronis* fait difficulté (*hēdēra tē cōrōnīs*)'. In his closing sentence he philosophically remarks 'Les rides aussi font la vérité d'un visage'. Very true.

C. J. FORDYCE

University of Glasgow

CARLO PRATO: *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. A. Seneca*. Introduzione, Testo Critico, Commento. Pp. xxxii + 125. Galatina: Adriatica Editrice, 1955. Paper.

No. 37 (429 Riese) in this edition of the epigrams attributed to Seneca earns from Prato the description *una visione lirica* (p. xv). (Let the candid reader judge if it be merited.) The high esteem in which he holds these compositions and a benevolent desire to introduce others to their delights must be the chief justification for this new edition, for there is not much enlightenment to be found in it. The text differs from Riese's in just under sixty places, sometimes for the better, more often for the worse; and the editor's own corrections are not impressive. The apparatus criticus, inexpertly derived from previous editions, is both deficient and inaccurate, though a good word ought to be said for the list of 'congetturi minori' at pp. xxv-xxviii. Half a dozen pages in a journal would have sufficed to convey what is new in all this.

The
have the
in help
Prato's
these po
they ne
the Com
Comme
Who wi
scribendi
hardy e
should
every p
first co
Does ar
might c
that iac
73); th
tamen (p
pater (p
is here
102)? C
decipere,
fifteen
(p. 86)
other h
real di
poems:
(R) and
(415 R)
—the r
Prato's
transla
editor u
a good
inessen
more th
(460 R)
interest
occasio
on in
elucida
of a co
woluend
The
the two
its type
Peterho
EMAN
sis in
tradu
solatio
Catar
sull'
Paper
In this
turns

The *loci similes* printed beneath the text have their value (they are of great assistance in helping the reader to decide whether Prato's encomia are justified or whether these poems are in truth mere *réchauffés*), but they need not be repeated all over again in the Commentary, as too often happens. The Commentary is a miserable performance. Who will write a short treatise *De commentariis scribendis*? It is sorely needed. If I were foolhardy enough to do such a thing I think I should cause to be printed at the head of every page the words 'The commentator's first concern is the needs of the reader.' Does any reader into whose hands this book might conceivably come require to be told that *taceo* is often found with participles (p. 73); that Propertius begins a verse with *tu tamen* (p. 88) or Ovid and others with *quam pater* (p. 92); that *dediscere* in 48 (440 R). 8 is here used for the first time of an animal (p. 102)? Or having been told that *dare uerba* = *decipere*, who is so sceptical as to demand fifteen references in support of the assertion (p. 86)? What are dictionaries for? On the other hand no proper guidance is offered in real difficulties, which do exist in these poems: e.g. the relationship between 5 (239 R) and 50 (442 R); 21 (412 R). 15-16; 23 (415 R). 15; 26 (418 R). 5; 28 (420 R). 2—the reference to the *loc. sim.* in support of Prato's *hiat* is dishonest—; 43 (435 R)—translation wanted; 58 (451 R)—has the editor understood this himself?; 65 (458 R)—a good example of Prato's passion for the inessential: not a word about *mél* (8), any more than about *mulière* at 72 (799 R). 2; 67 (460 R). 7—meaning of *depressa*?, etc. Some interesting points relating to the date and occasion of various poems which are touched on in the scrappy Introduction receive no elucidation in the Commentary. Prato's idea of a commentator would appear to be *uir in uoluentis lexicis satis diligens*.

The book is neatly but inaccurately printed; the two lists of *Corrigenda* by no means exhaust its typographical errors.

E. J. KENNEY

Peterhouse, Cambridge

EMANUELE RAPISARDA: *Consolatio Poesis in Boezio*. Introduzione, testo e traduzione delle poesie della 'Consolatio Philosophiae'. Pp. xlix+60. Catania: Università (Centro di Studi sull' Antico Cristianesimo), 1956. Paper, L. 1,000.

In this attractive book, Sr. Rapisarda returns to Boethius and to his *Consolatio*

Philosophiae with the aim of presenting to us the poems, separately, with text and translation and with an introduction in which he defends this procedure, because, as he claims, the poems possess an 'interior unity' in which we can perceive most clearly the nature of Boethius' ultimate vision of the world. This is not a mere synthesis of Neoplatonism and Christianity, but, the author holds, a vision which comes not from the 'Neoplatonic natural endowment of man, but is the gift of the divine grace which illuminates and guides the poet to a vision of the universe quite different from that which presented itself to the eyes of the Neoplatonists'. Rapisarda sets out his case so persuasively that many will feel that his conclusions are near the truth. They will agree also that in this book, which Dante read for his comfort after the death of Beatrice, Boethius is writing under the shadow of urgent problems presented by his own situation in prison and under the threat of death, and is composing no mere philosophical exercise. But, after all, the title of the work is *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, and Philosophy is the consoler even if her speeches have at times a Christian overtone, which appears as well in the poetical pieces. But here too are Stoic, Neoplatonic, and other commonplaces, so that it is not an easy thing to point definitely to specifically Christian elements in the thought of Boethius, though he was undoubtedly a Christian as his *Theological Tractates* show.

F. J. E. RABY

Jesus College, Cambridge

A. J. VERMEULEN: *The Semantic Development of Gloria in early-Christian Latin*. (Latinitas Christianorum Primæva, xii.) Pp. xxiv+236; 8 plates. Nijmegen: Dekker and van de Vegt, 1956. Paper, fl. 12.50.

THIS is no mere collection of statistical tables, but a continuous and readable discussion of a key word in early Christian theology. Vermeulen begins with an account of the LXX use of *doxa* to translate *kabod*. This was suitable only where *kabod* meant honour or, perhaps, majesty; by itself *doxa* cannot express the truths about the concrete being of God which are conveyed by the Hebrew word, and its use could easily mislead readers familiar with its secular Greek senses of opinion and fame. The danger increased when *gloria* was chosen to render *doxa* in Latin versions of the Bible, and,

broadly speaking, is was only when the context protected the meaning that it was saved from contamination by the secular concept of renown.

Vermeulen briefly examines the use of *gloria*, *claritas*, and *maiestas* in the Old Latin and the Vulgate. Of the three he holds *gloria* to be the least adequate rendering of *doxa* in its biblical sense. The rest of the book is arranged in two large chapters, (ii) The origin of a new Christian concept: glory or renown in the eyes of God; (iii) Biblical *gloria* and the western Christian conception of glory. In each chapter the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, and Leo I are investigated under a number of sub-headings. Some account is also taken of liturgical material, particularly doxologies, and of expressions of *gloria* in early Christian art. There are eight fine plates. The general conclusions are as follows. For the earlier authors *gloria* is more often a bad word than a good one, something which Christians must not seek; but the pagan notion of renown was gradually Christianized by being construed as, primarily, *gloria apud Deum*, the chief expressions of which were the *gloria martyrum* and the *gloria Christi* (won by His victory over sin and death). The biblical sense of *kabod* and the New Testament use of *doxa* to express truths about God were frequently obscured by taking *gloria* to mean renown, but the Latin word was more adequately theologized, so to speak, by the later Fathers. Ambrose, influenced by Origen (here always spelt Origen) and Neoplatonism, connects it with 'light-mysticism', which at least gives it the concrete sense of God's being and self-manifestation; Augustine is profoundly biblical. This development was assisted by the Arian controversy since, in the West, *gloria* came to mean the very substance of God and was asserted, in that sense, of Son and Holy Spirit.

This is a careful and fruitful study, even if it arouses some feeling that the evidence is being pressed into too precise a pattern and that perhaps too much space is devoted to the martyrs. The section on the Latin Bible might well have been longer, and some examination of one or two theologians of less stature would have been useful in order to test whether the five outstanding writers are truly representative. However, there are ample margins which invite annotation. There is an index of Greek and Latin words. Although the layout makes it comparatively easy to find authors and books, an *index locorum* would have increased the book's value.

Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva is building

up an excellent collection of monographs. More studies of important words, carrying the results of recent biblical studies into the patristic field, will be most welcome.

S. L. GREENSLADE

University of Durham

HARRY AUSTRYN WOLFSON: *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. i: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation. Pp. xxviii+635. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 80s. net.

In 1947 Professor Wolfson of Harvard published a massive study of Philo 'designed to serve as a general prolegomenon to the major problems of religious philosophy for the seventeen centuries following Philo'. It bore the sub-title, 'Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam', and claimed that, by his philosophical system in general and more particularly by his manner of relating philosophy to a revealed book, Philo had furnished the notions common to the medieval philosophy of religion alike in East and West until the revolutionary ideas of Spinoza broke up the accepted pattern. The present volume begins the substantiation of that claim, so far as concerns the Christian Fathers. It deals with three themes only, Faith, Trinity, and Incarnation; another volume is to follow.

Christian students of patristic thought will be eager to know what a Jewish scholar equipped with so extensive a knowledge of Plato and Aristotle, of Philo and Rabbinic philosophy, makes of the development of Christian thought in its Greco-Roman setting. In one sense they will not be disappointed, for the book is learned, lucid, and fair-minded. I suspect, however, that they will find it less exciting than they had expected. The author is usually content to analyse and expound; he wants to show what philosophical concepts and terms the Fathers used, whence they derived them, how they can be related to or distinguished from each other, and so forth, all of which is done well and fully. But less judgement is passed than in most Christian works on patristic doctrine. Wolfson neither tells us what he makes of the doctrines nor considers how successful the Fathers were in their use of philosophy to expound them. He does not grapple with the vital question whether the substance of Christian religion was imperilled by philosophical trappings; he simply describes the

different
As he him
to study
Fathers,
doctrines.
detachme

But i
doctrine
hind the
doctrine
philosoph
Fathers, I
Origen w
who tried
philosoph
consequen
neverthele
without t
that I sha
Fathers' v
handy for
sure that
essential.
find that
is only the
bute too m
to recall t
Philo cor
was paid
and the ge
in the Hel
own delir
from asking
tory and
and thoug
little *odium*
calm to sa
in the exte
and that
of Christi
Logos of
rence bet
that the
and the
thought a
that differ
understood

University

Aurelii
De Beas
libri. A
prolegom
W. M.
et Medi
Spectru
This is a
brief intro

different attitudes to faith and philosophy. As he himself writes, he has not undertaken to study the Christian doctrines of the Fathers, but the philosophy behind their doctrines. Hence the atmosphere of calm detachment.

But is the separation of philosophy and doctrine possible? Was the philosophy behind the doctrine, or, more coercively, the doctrine behind the philosophy? It was not philosophy as such which mattered to the Fathers, but religion; and this is as true of Origen who welcomed it as of Tertullian who tried to repudiate it. Granted that philosophical thought and language had real consequences in patristic teaching, it is nevertheless frustrating to study the clothing without the body. Though I am confident that I shall learn much in detail about the Fathers' use of philosophy if I keep this book handy for frequent consultation, I am less sure that I shall discover anything truly essential. At present I am disappointed to find that the question dominant in my mind is only the historical one, does Wolfson attribute too much to Philo? It may not be unfair to recall that more than one reviewer of his Philo commented that too little attention was paid to post-Aristotelian philosophers and the general stream of popular philosophy in the Hellenistic world. Moreover, Wolfson's own delimitation of his field precludes him from asking what real difference biblical history and theology have made to human life and thought. One almost begins to wish for a little *odium theologicum*. It is altogether too calm to say that 'in Christianity a new stage in the existence of the Logos is introduced' and that 'philosophically the incarnate Logos of Christianity is analogous to the immanent Logos of Philo'. It is precisely in the difference between incarnation and immanence that the scandal of Christian thought lies, and the major questions about patristic thought are whether and how it preserved that difference, and how its implications were understood.

S. L. GREENSLADE

University of Durham

Aurelii Augustini Contra Academicos, De Beata Vita, necnon De Ordine libri. Ad fidem codicum recensuit prolegomenis notisque instruxit W. M. GREEN. (Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia ii.) Pp. 150. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1956. Paper.

This is a text of the three dialogues with a brief introduction, a select apparatus criticus,

and an apparatus of references to parallel literature, but without commentary. The standard text of these works has so far been Knöll's in the *Vienna Corpus*, published in 1922, and this will continue to be indispensable to the scholar who needs a detailed account of the manuscripts and a full apparatus. Knöll's judgements, however, have not all been accepted without criticism. Green has added some information about manuscripts and produced a better working text.

Accepting Knöll's classification of the manuscripts, he differs somewhat in his opinion of their relative value. Since both agree that the manuscripts of *Contra Academicos* and *De Ordine* fall into two easily distinguishable groups, neither of which is markedly superior to the other, it is not surprising that Green sometimes follows one family where Knöll had accepted the other. But in the case of *De Beata Vita*, although Green, following Bischoff, assigns the Bobbio manuscript Ambrosianus M 67 sup. to the ninth century, against Knöll's *saec. x-xi*, he nevertheless concludes—and rightly so, it seems—that Knöll placed too much confidence in it. Other fresh evidence about the manuscripts includes Lehmann's discovery that Harley 3039 came from Lorsch and can be dated to the first half of the ninth century (Knöll, *saec. x*). In *Contra Academicos* Remensis 382 has been corrected from a manuscript of the other family; Knöll puts this corrector in the eleventh or twelfth century, Green in the tenth.

The new text is not revolutionary, for Green frequently returns to Maurist readings against Knöll, especially in *De Beata Vita*. Over considerable stretches his differences from Knöll average one or two to a page of 400 words, of which a large number are variations only in spelling, though some, of course, are more substantial. In *De Beata Vita* 8 Green has *theoris* against Knöll's *curis*, and in *De Ordine* ii. 27 *potentias*, with Eugippius, against Knöll's *sententias*. At the close of *Contra Academicos* i Green keeps *prandium paratum esse nuntiatum est*, which Knöll dropped. But in *De Beata Vita* 4 they both read *Plotini* against the Maurist *Platonis*, and in *Contra Academicos* ii. 5 both prefer *castissime* to the Maurist *cautissime*.

Green's citation of the principal manuscripts *en bloc* by families, α and β , facilitates quick reference, but his critical apparatus has in places been too much compressed, so that, for example, one cannot always be clear whether a reading marked as Knöll's is his conjecture or has manuscript support. In *Contra Academicos* ii. 25 the apparatus should record the variant *tantum* for *tamen* since it

was accepted by the Maurists and influenced Alfarc's interpretation of Augustine's conversion.

The collection of references to parallel passages in St. Augustine's own writings and elsewhere is much fuller than Knöll's, and of real value, particularly as there has been so much interest recently in 'the young Augustine'.

S. L. GREENSLADE

University of Durham

GERHARD BENDZ: *Emendationen zu Caelius Aurelianus*. (Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund. 44.) Pp. 171. Lund: Gleerup, 1954. Paper, Kr. 20.

VALUABLE light has already been thrown on the writings of Caelius Aurelianus by G. Bendz, principally in his *Caeliana* (Lund, 1943 = *L.U.A.* xxxviii. 4), a treatment of textual problems and linguistic problems closely connected with the establishment of the text. Study of the text is complicated by the fact that only one manuscript, the Codex Laurehamensis, survived until the sixteenth century, to be lost after the appearance of the *editiones principes*: two rediscovered minor fragments of this manuscript, however, permit some assessment of the merit of Sichart's edition of the *Tardarum Passionum libri*. While an additional complication results from the loss of Soranus' *Περὶ δέξων καὶ χροίων νόσων*, of which the *Celerum et Tardarum Passionum libri* are a translation, Caelius' practice as a translator can be tested in his *Gynacia*.

The present work contains twenty-six sections, thirteen devoted to lexicographical problems, thirteen to palaeographical points. In a brief introduction, Bendz characterizes the earlier *Caeliana* as excessively conservative: his changed attitude is reflected in a number of instances in which he abandons his former view. The lexicographical problems are most commonly shown to have their origin in palaeographical error: in this way Bendz rejects *constrictura* for *strictura* (*Cel.* i. 69); *decantio* for *decantatio* (*Tard.* i. 175); *delenimentum* for *lenimentum* (*Tard.* i. 7); *destructivus* for *destructivus* (*Cel.* iii. 20; ii. 159); *inventio* for *intentio* (*Cel.* ii. 94; iii. 39); *transforationis partes* for *transvorationis partes* (*Tard.* i. 56—he also emends *faciem* to *faucium*); *viscellum* (*viscellatus*) for *iussellum* (*iussellatus*): he similarly rejects *pectio* (*Tard.* i. 98) and *resumptorius* (*Cel.* iii. 95). In considering *circa* in the sense of *secundum*, Bendz also examines Ennodius, *Epp.* ii. 22. 2 and Pacianus, *Epp.*

ii. 2, concluding that here and in the other examples cited in *T.L.L.*, as in Caelius, there is confusion of *circa* and *iuxta*. In § 7 he admits unparalleled *manificus* (= *manu factus*) at *Tard.* ii. 218; *Cel.* i. 109; iii. 165, and ironical *magnificus* at *Cel.* ii. 85 and 123. § 11 considers the use of *utque* for *ut*; § 13, first stressing the ease of confusion of *prae*, *pro*-, and *per*-, and (acoustically) of *prae* and *re*-, reviews the numerous verbs compounded by Caelius with *prae*-, in which the prefix has temporal force (= *prius*).

The second part contains, after some introductory remarks, *eine Reihe von Emendationen*, arranged according to the nature of the error involved in the passages under review. Bendz considers instances of error in punctuation and in word-division, of displacement of words and groups of words, of haplography and dittography, of error involving a nasal, and of incorrect expansion of abbreviated forms; other losses of letters or groups of letters; mistakes due to attraction; the particular confusions of *autem*, *etiam*, and (*et*) *enim*, of *solutus*, *solitus*, and *solidus*, and of *est*, *et*, and *ex*; cases of confusion of *a* with *o* and *u*; of *e* with *t*; of *e* with *i* and *t*; of *f* with *s*; of *n* with *u*; of *r* with *c*; and of *u* with *a*. The index of passages whose text is discussed includes fourteen non-Caelian passages; the *Wortindex* includes subject-references.

D. R. BRADLEY

University of Manchester

DENIS VAN BERCHEM: *Le Martyre de la Légion Thébaine*. Essai sur la formation d'une légende. (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 8.) Pp. 64. Basel: Reinhardt, 1956. Paper, 7.50 Sw. fr.

THE Passion of the Theban Legion was, according to the letter prefixed to it, written by Eucherius, bishop of Lyons in the second quarter of the fifth century. He tells us that his informants declared that they got the story from Isaac, bishop of Geneva, who, he believed, heard it from Theodore, who was bishop of Octodurus in 381 and founded the cult. The tradition does not inspire much confidence, and Professor van Berchem demonstrates that Eucherius derived the historical background of his narrative from Lactantius and Orosius, and even the geographical setting from a road book such as that on which the Peutinger Table was based, whose errors he reproduces. Is there, he asks, any genuine core to this legend of the massacre of a Theban legion by Maximian at

Acaunum
against Ch
reasons. C
Acaunum
and the ti
primicerius
a Diocletian
was presun
miana, sta
baid, with
of Thrace)
The first p
not so wel
Augustus t
with certai
marched a
of a dioc
On the sec
promises u
right, but
embroider
there is any
be genuine
that Bisho
oriental, v
East, and
Theban I
Maurice o
been a mil
his unit. T
But one n
may have
contempor
martyrs.

Jesus Colle

L. A. M
Californi
15, No. 4
Angeles:
Press, 19

THIS is th
from both
origins. It
scholarly
states that
complete a
to investig
modern sc
hypothesis
element in
old-and-ne
view, he ac
(pp. 158 ff.
is a moon-
attempt to
case had a
pair, if Pe

Acaunum because they refused to march against Christians? He answers No for two reasons. Constantius Caesar, in whose zone Acaunum lay, did not persecute Christians, and the titles borne by two of the martyrs, *primicerius* and *senator*, are not appropriate to a Diocletianic legion (the 'Theban legion' was presumably III Diocletiana or I Maximiana, stationed in the Notitia in the Thebaid, with detachments in the field army of Thrace), but only to cavalry *vexillationes*. The first point is hardly conclusive. We are not so well informed on the relation of an Augustus to his Caesar as to be able to affirm with certainty that Maximian cannot have marched an army through a border province of a diocese administered by Constantius. On the second point Professor van Berchem promises us a fuller study. He may well be right, but the incorrect titles may be a later embroidery of a genuine story. Not that there is any positive ground for believing it to be genuine. Professor van Berchem suggests that Bishop Theodore may have been an oriental, who brought the story from the East, and that Maurice, the *primicerius* of the Theban Legion, may be identical with Maurice of Apamea, who is also said to have been a military commander martyred with his unit. These, he admits, are speculations. But one may agree that Bishop Theodore may have been no more scrupulous than his contemporary St. Ambrose in 'discovering' martyrs.

A. H. M. JONES

Jesus College, Cambridge

L. A. MacKAY: *Janus*. (Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Phil., Vol. 15, No. 4.) Pp. 25. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956. Paper, 50 c.

THIS is the latest effort to disconnect Janus from both *ianua* and *ianus*, at least in his origins. It is unconvincing, but does not lack scholarly ingenuity. The author plainly states that he 'does not aim at offering a complete account of the god' but wants only to investigate 'how far ancient evidence and modern scholarship are consistent with the hypothesis that . . . perhaps the most basic element in the conception of the god was the old-and-new moon' (p. 157). With this in view, he accepts the form *Dianus as original (pp. 158 ff.), incidentally assuming that Diana is a moon-goddess. He does not, by the way, attempt to explain why the Romans in that case had a pair of lunar deities (more than a pair, if Pettazzoni's theory of Carmentis is

true, as he seems to hold), when they had a cult of Luna under her own name. Iana Luna of course likewise comes in for mention (p. 160). There is some space devoted to the importance of the lunar month in the practical reckoning of time especially for country people; but this (pp. 161 ff.), while making it perfectly possible that there was a moon-cult of some sort in early Rome (why not simply that of Luna?) goes no great way towards proving that Janus was its object. Next comes an examination of the god's cult-titles (pp. 164 ff.), some of which (Geminus, Patulcius, Clusius or Clusius) are more or less plausibly interpreted as referring to the beginning and end of the lunar month. On p. 166 the author frankly admits that sundry other titles 'do not seem directly susceptible of any lunar connection'. To those he mentions under this heading I would add Iunonius and the whole association between Janus and Juno, which helps the lunar interpretation of the god only by the assumption (p. 165) that Iuno Lucina is a moon-goddess. How many moons did the Romans worship on this theory?

Several brief arguments follow. One is from the familiar two-faced image of the god (but how old is that or any other image in Roman cult?), suggested to be a development from the pair of opposed crescents found on a few of the older coins (p. 167). Then the *ianus* itself is discussed, in its capacity as a *transitio peruia* (Cicero, *N.D.* ii. 67), hence as a symbol of the passage from one month to the next; then come the dates of Janus' sacrifices (the kalends), which admittedly would be consistent with his supposed lunar nature; then his relations in cult and (late) myth to other deities, and a brief consideration (pp. 173 f.) of his connexion with doorways. Here MacKay commits himself to the statement that it 'is now generally admitted' that such connexion is secondary. I for one have never admitted anything of the kind, for it seems to me that if we take it as primary, everything we know about Janus and his cult follows naturally and easily, whereas other theories, for instance the lunar one, involve supposing, as MacKay repeatedly does, that the god's original nature was quite forgotten at a comparatively early date. His association with trade and coinage, with springs and fountains, with warfare and with beginnings are then handled briefly, and the essay closes with a short description of his 'demotion' from his original status.

Incidentally, Liber and Bacchus are not identical (p. 170); it is extremely rash to assume that Hekate is the Moon (p. 174);

I see nothing inconsistent (see p. 176) with the formal opening of the *ianus* when war broke out in Ennius' metaphorical statement that *Discordia taetra* broke open the gates of war (if that is what the poet refers to); Livy xxii. 57. 6 does not say that when the *Gallus et Galla*, *Graecus et Graeca* were buried alive this was preceded by a human sacrifice, but only that such a sacrifice had on some unnamed occasion taken place on the same spot.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

FRANZ ALTHEIM: *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage. 1. Band: *Grundlagen und Grundbegriffe*; 2. Band: *Der geschichtliche Ablauf*. (Sammlung Götschen, 1035, 1052.) Pp. 116, 164. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956. Paper, DM. 2.40 each.

THIS edition of a work which originally appeared in 1931-3 (see *C.R.* xlv. 228 f., xlv. 182, xlviii. 40 f.) has indeed been *umgearbeitet*, for its entire form is changed. The contents of volume 1 may be indicated by the headings of the sections, which are: i: Grundlagen: 1. Einwanderer und Ansässige; 2. Die Etrusker; ii: Römische Form; 3. Die Götter; 4. Religio; iii: Die Kunder; 5. Vates; 6. Der Geschichtsschreiber: Tacitus. Thus it is in effect an outline of early Italian history, including proto-history, with especial reference to Rome. The last section contains a relatively large amount of what some would think better suited for a history of literature than of religion. The archaeological part is, as might be expected, excellently informed and fresh in tone; it is perhaps not to be expected that everyone will agree with all the opinions expressed, especially as the small size of the work obliges them to be stated dogmatically, with very little documentation. There is no room in a short notice to give a list of my own agreements and disagreements, but I gladly admit that I have learned some new facts and interesting theories. Volume 2 takes the reader from the earliest times to Constantine at rather breathless speed, rendered somewhat less so by large omissions of detail. Even so, some room is found for matters which ordinarily might not be mentioned in so short a treatise, for instance on pp. 46 ff., which discuss alliteration and the initial accent of early Latin; I am not convinced that Celtic influence had so much to do with either as Altheim thinks. That Felix and Epaphro-

ditus mean the same (p. 60) is hardly to be assumed now, and it is surprising to find, on p. 74, the twice refuted fable about Gallus in the *Georgics* accepted as true. On the whole, my opinion of the strong and weak points of the work has not altered very much since I reviewed the first edition (see above), except that I now incline to make a longer list of the excellencies and a shorter one of the defects. The work in its new form is decidedly not one to neglect.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

FRANZ DORNSEIFF: *Kleine Schriften*, i: *Antike und Alter Orient; Interpretationen*. Pp. viii+444; 3 plates. Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1956. Boards, DM. 14.50.

THIS first volume of Dornseiff's papers and reviews contains thirty items, published with three exceptions between 1933 and 1940. Their connecting theme is the unity of the Middle East, literary and mythological, from Mesopotamia to Egypt and Greece and even Italy, and particularly in the period 1100-550 B.C. On this subject Dornseiff has been often derided and sometimes justified, and those who still doubt whether the Greeks owed more than arts and crafts to the older civilizations of the East will profit by reading this book, provided that they can separate sense from silliness. For the more irritable Hellenist the best paper is on Hesiod's *Theogony* (from *L'Antiquité Classique*, 1937), the worst perhaps on the *Pentateuch* (from *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1934-8).

R. M. COOK.

Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge

MAX POHLENZ: *Griechische Freiheit*. Wesen und Werden eines Lebensideals. Pp. 212. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1955. Cloth, DM. 14.50.

THIS work, by a great German scholar, seeks to examine the idea of 'freedom' in all its ramifications as a fundamental concept in Greek thought, of importance to all who are concerned with the meaning of the term and its use in modern times. It is therefore a popular work on Greek thought in the best sense of the term 'popular'. A short introduction on the idea of freedom in early Greece is followed by a discussion of the effects of the victory of the Greeks over Persia and of the

growing national consciousness in emphasizing the ideological differences between Greek and barbarian as a stimulus to further thought, not least on the question of slavery. This is followed by the main theme of the book, treated more or less chronologically: the idea of freedom in relation to the *polis* and the individual in it in the classical period, and the development on this basis of the thought of the Hellenistic Age (which, particularly through Stoicism and its teachers and adherents, includes the Roman Republic and Empire) in the changed political and social conditions of a wider world.

Without an oppressive apparatus of scholarship (but with useful notes on detail to which Greek and Latin quotations are banished) the book displays the vast erudition of its author. Through his treatment of the theme of freedom a great complex of ideas is presented, on political, moral, and psychological issues, with a lucid exposition of the contributions and relationships of Greek thinkers who directly or indirectly were preoccupied with them. At the same time the historical events which form the background of these issues are, at any rate for the classical period, kept well before the reader. The Periclean ideal of the individual's relation to the community is perhaps too readily accepted as a contrast to the fourth century, and for the fourth century the reaction to the idea of citizen duty and the development of individualism are overstressed and given too large a part as factors in the decline of the city state. Furthermore the effects of Alexander's conquests and of the rise of the Hellenistic kingdoms do not receive the attention they deserve in a book for the non-specialist reader, who is made well aware of the significance of the *polis* in earlier thought, but is told little of the changed background against which Zeno and his successors developed their teaching.

The clash of ideas relating to Greeks and Barbarians, Athens and Sparta, the Individual and the State, *Physis* and *Nomos*, are well treated, and the preoccupation with freedom is used to link some of the great problems which concerned Greek thinkers: the nature of the Good Life, the nature of Virtue, the Mind, and the Soul, and the relation of the Individual to the political unit, to the World, and to the supreme principle of the Universe. The great value of the book is its demonstration that there is hardly an aspect of Greek thought which is not touched by the idea of freedom. The exposition of the Stoic ideas on the nature of individual freedom and ultimate responsibility leads Pohlenz on to examine the teachings of early

exponents of Christianity for similarities to and differences from pagan thought.

The specialist on limited aspects of the themes treated could no doubt find material for criticism. For those, however, whose main interests do not lie in ancient philosophy this treatment of a fundamental idea in its many ramifications makes particularly stimulating reading.

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

NAPHTALI LEWIS and MEYER REINHOLD: *Roman Civilization*. Selected Readings edited with Introduction and Notes. Vol. ii: *The Empire*. (Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, vol. xlv.) Pp. vii+652. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford Univ. Press), 1955. Cloth, 60s. net.

THIS is the second volume of a work of which the first volume (on the Roman Republic) has already been noticed in this journal (1953, 214). In 652 pages it provides in translation a selection of the sources for the history of the Roman Empire from Augustus to Constantine. There is a bibliography of books and articles in English, a glossary of terms (too elementary and sometimes unilluminating), an index of authors, and a general index. The latter is inadequate for a book of this size and type: thus there is no entry relating to a famous inscription under 'Heba' or 'century' or 'electoral procedure', but only an obscure one under 'Germanicus', 'honours after death'.

Most aspects of Roman imperial affairs, political, social, economic, religious, and cultural are covered; military operations have, very wisely, been omitted. The translations are for the most part excerpted or adapted from such well-known versions as those of the Loeb Classical Library; others are renderings by the editors of the book, who claim that more than 200 of the 600-odd passages are now for the first time made available in English translation. Certainly inscriptions are well represented, and material is drawn from papyri and ostraca where necessary. Numismatic material is not included. A fairly extensive check seems to indicate that the translations are reliable.

One wonders who is going to use this collection in its entirety. It is frankly admitted that the whole idea of the provision of translations from Latin and Greek and the omission from the bibliography of books and

articles in languages other than English are due 'to the realities of the American educational scene'. The recognition of another reality—that the Empire cannot be covered by undergraduates in this sort of detail with profit—should have suggested a division into two volumes at A.D. 180. In any case a very expert teacher would be needed to get the full value from the collection. It is, in fact, too big a collection, and, for soft-currency countries, costs too much.

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

F. R. COWELL: *Cicero and the Roman Republic*. Pp. xviii+398; 32 plates, 3 maps. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 5s. net.

It is good that this book, first published in 1948 (cf. C.R. 1949, p. 59), should now be made available to a wider public in a cheaper form. The author has not been able to reproduce the rather complicated and highly coloured isotype diagrams which were a feature of the first edition, but the plates are still included. Apart from correcting some slips (though the Third Macedonian war still masquerades as the Second on p. 118), he has made many minor alterations. These include the addition of a little more on Rome's early wars, Cornelia, clientship, the *Comitia Centuriata* (where he now supposes 193 instead of 373 centuries), the years 87–83 B.C., J. Carcopino's views on Cicero's Letters, the adjustment of some statistics made necessary by the reduced purchasing power of the pound, some retouching of Julius Caesar and of the anticipation of the Empire, together with a new section on 'The Private Life of a Young Man about Town', chiefly Catullus and Clodia (where Cowell has misunderstood the *illic* of Catullus 68. 35). Thus Cowell has made good use of the opportunity to improve his book, but some may wonder whether he has gone far enough. In parts it is a little long-winded and not free from repetitions; a more radical rehandling and shortening might have made it better suited to the needs of some of its new readers. Cowell has perhaps been over-generous and tried to pack in too much, while he hurries backwards and forwards from early to late Republic in a manner not always easy for the general reader to follow. Also, could not Cicero have been made more of the central figure that the title leads one to expect (or else his name have been banished from the title)? Cowell's frequent quotations from the sources are such a welcome feature that it would

have been useful if he could have squeezed in the relevant references. But, as was said in the review of the original book, it is a thoughtful and useful account of the economic, social, and political life of the Republic by a writer who is keenly alive to the relevance and importance of the problem of the Republic's collapse and of the permanent value of Cicero's belief in the rule of law and social harmony. It well deserves the wider circulation that it can now be expected to enjoy.

H. H. SCULLARD

King's College, London

FRANZ ALTHEIM: *Römische Geschichte*. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage, Band i: *Bis zur Schlacht bei Pydna*. ii: *Bis zur Schlacht bei Actium*. (Sammlung Göschen.) Pp. 124, 129. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956. Paper, DM. 2.40 each.

This short history of Rome to the end of the Republican era, which was first published in 1948, appears now with certain additions and deletions in a second edition. It is clearly intended as something more than a general survey for the layman. The very fact that Altheim on several occasions resorts to a detailed analysis of the ancient evidence, together with his frequent quotation from Greek and Latin texts, and his extensive use of footnotes embodying a technical bibliography, suggests that it is a work designed primarily for the benefit of the young university student. As such, therefore, it must be judged, and, while one must recognize its many commendable points, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in his attempt to combine a semi-critical approach with extreme brevity Altheim has fallen, perhaps to some extent unavoidably, between two stools. Certain aspects of history, more particularly those upon which the author has concentrated in his own researches, are discussed in considerable detail and with a due regard for rival interpretations. Others, however, notably the vital constitutional and economic aspects, are afforded the most cursory treatment, with the result that Altheim often lapses into a form of dogmatism which, though pardonable enough in a textbook for the general reader, is inclined in a work of this nature to be dangerously misleading.

The first volume begins with three chapters—'Das vorrömische Italien', 'Italische und römische Form', and 'Das alte Rom'—in

which Altheim embodies his already well-known arguments on the racial origin of the Italian peoples and on the cultural and religious influences to which Italian and primitive Roman society was subjected. He here displays a complete mastery of the material, as we should expect; and at the same time he provides his readers with a valuable insight into the beginnings of Rome's civilization, so essential to a proper understanding of her development. Unfortunately, however, the discussion is so extended that little more than half of the first volume remains for an account of Republican history in all its aspects from 509 to 168 B.C. One result of this, of course, is that Altheim has had to be drastically selective. Neither the Publilian legislation of 339 B.C., for example, nor the important reform of the *comitia centuriata* in the third century receives even a mention. Still more serious perhaps, in view of the critical tone which is set in the early chapters, is the fact that Altheim has found himself forced to make unqualified pronouncements on matters which are the subject of heated debate without giving so much as an indication in the footnotes that a problem exists. Thus we find not infrequently such categorical, and to some no doubt startling, assertions as that the plebeians originally lacked *Geschlechtsnamen* and were debarred from the consulship and the Senate (p. 54), and that the *tribuni plebis* after 471 B.C. were the representatives of the four *tribus urbanae* (p. 59).

The same lack of balance is to be found in the second volume, where again little short of half the available space is allocated to a detailed account of Julius Caesar's plans for the future of Rome and to a discussion on the ideology of the Principate, and where by contrast the events of the vital period from 133 to 50 B.C. are crammed into no more than twenty pages. Altheim no doubt regards the complicated political manoeuvres of the late second and the first century as more or less irrelevant to his main theme, but, in view of the amount of space devoted to a consideration of the aims and motives of Caesar, it is somewhat disturbing to find the unqualified accusation that Crassus was implicated in the Catilinarian conspiracy (p. 41), or that the legislative programme of Gaius Gracchus was dictated very largely by his desire to avenge himself upon the Senate (pp. 29 f.). More striking, in the light of Altheim's peculiar concern in Chapter I with the various crises in late Republican history and their cause, is his failure to lay any emphasis upon the part played by commercial and financial interests in shaping Roman policy and in undermining Senatorial influ-

ence. Presumably he does not subscribe to the view that the growth of an independent equestrian class constituted a serious threat to the stability of the old constitution; but in this case he should at least have indicated to his young readers that it is one which has a very wide following.

The bibliography is reasonably extensive for a work of this size, and has been brought up to date since the appearance of the first edition. Very naturally, perhaps, it is restricted in the main to works in German. But this is not an invariable rule; and it is regrettable that Altheim has not seen fit to afford some recognition to the several eminent Italian scholars who have made so notable a contribution to the study of Republican history in the last twenty to thirty years.

E. S. STAVELEY

Bedford College, London.

MARGARET DEANESLY: *A History of Early Medieval Europe, 476 to 911*. Pp. xii + 620. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 30s. net.

THIS is the last volume to appear in Methuen's well-known *History of Medieval Europe*. The series is intended to provide reliable and manageable textbooks for use in schools and universities. The period from A.D. 476 to 911 is one which presents peculiar difficulties to the historian. It makes the greatest possible demands upon his historical equipment. He must understand the significance of the Hellenistic-Oriental civilization which affected that of Rome so deeply and lived on in the Byzantine and Islamic world. He must be able to set out what is known about the barbarian invaders, their social and political institutions and their art and culture. He must trace the whole process of economic change from the declining ancient world to the beginnings of the Feudal Age. He must attempt a picture of the relations of Church and State in the West and show how the way was being prepared for the conflict between Empire and Papacy which filled the great medieval centuries. In addition, he must not neglect the important subject of learning, literature, and the arts in this crucial period. All this has to be done under the handicap of often unsatisfactory sources and the aid of archaeological evidence with the use of which the historian may not be familiar.

It can be said at once that Professor Deanesly has disentangled and dealt with these problems in a clear and convincing

way. The writer of a textbook has inevitably to provide many a passage full of necessary but uninteresting facts, and has the difficult task of presenting these in such a way as to form a preparation for the things which the historian wants to know and the undergraduate ought to want to know. I think that this has been achieved by Miss Deanesly with a fair measure of success. In a work of this size and with a subject of such complexity, there are bound to be points that call for correction or criticism. P. 19: the Welsh *llan* does not mean saint, but 'church' (*Llanbedr* means Church of Peter, not *sanctus Petrus*). P. 32: Fortunatus did not bring the relic of the Holy Cross to Poitiers. It was sent by the Emperor Justin. P. 50: where it is said that 'Cassiodorus' text seems to have been preserved in the first and oldest quire of the famous codex Amiatinus', is not Miss Deanesly referring to the suggestion of Bishop Browne that this quaternion was actually cut out of the copy of the *codex grandior* of Cassiodorus from which the Codex Amiatinus was presumably copied? P. 126: for Arab conquests of the 'sixth century', read 'seventh century'. P. 173: the change in the language of the Mass at Rome from Greek to Latin may have taken place later than the second half of the third century. See T. Klauser, *The Western Liturgy and its History*, 1952, and literature mentioned there. The change may have taken place under the influence of Ambrose. P. 207: Islam did not 'give Europe back the logic of Aristotle'. It always had the *Logica Vetus*, and the *Logica Nova* seems also, in part, to go back to Boëthius. The only translation from the Arabic appears to have been Gerard of Cremona's version of the *Posterior Analytics* (before 1187). P. 225: the praise of the bee in the Exultet can hardly owe anything to Celtic influences. Is not its inspiration rather Virgilian? P. 230: it is not now customary to ascribe the *Cloud of Unknowing* to Walter Hilton. Pp. 293 and 346: Miss Deanesly calls the famous *Donation of Constantine* a 'fine piece of propaganda' and a work of piety. Is it not better to regard it as an unscrupulous forgery, used by Pope Stephen to press his demands on Pepin, and employed by the Papacy to advance its power, until the time came when it was inexpedient to rely on a document which purported to show the Papal privileges as derived from the secular power? P. 346: the verses *O felix Roma* are not certainly by Paulinus of Aquileia and they are not a pilgrim hymn. On the other hand (p. 503), Paulinus is probably the author of the hymn *Congregavit nos in unum*, which was written, not for the

washing of feet on Maundy Thursday, but for the Synod of Friuli (796 or 797). Chapter xx: the interpretation of the meaning of Charles the Great's 'coronation' would have been more valuable if account had been taken of the work of Schramm, Folz, and, above all, of Ullmann. P. 437: Theodosius, not Constantine, was the father of Arcadius and Honorius, and Paschasius Radbertus' *Epitaphium Arsenii* (a pseudonym for Wala, cousin of Charles the Great) was written after Wala's death in 836. Pp. 516-17: it is hardly correct to say that 'the use of rhyme in early medieval Latin verse is said to have sprung from the union of Irish and Italian scholarship' or that 'the Carolingian period . . . was notable for the introduction of rhymed Latin verse into the liturgy'.

In the sections on art and architecture use might have been made of E. Mâle, *La fin du paganisme en Gaule*, 1950. It is a pity that R. Latouche, *Les origines de l'économie occidentale*, 1956, did not appear in time to be taken into consideration in the discussion on economic change.

F. J. E. RABY

Jesus College, Cambridge

PHILIPPE DE SCHAEZTEN: *Index des terminaisons des marques de potiers gallo-romains sur terra sigillata*. (Collection Latomus, xxiv). Pp. 80. Brussels: Latomus, 1956. Paper, 110 B.fr.

In the task of deciphering the thousand or more potters' stamps on the Samian ware contained in his collection of finds made in Tongres the author, like many other archaeologists, has found Dr. F. Oswald's *Index of Potters' Stamps on Terra Sigillata* (1931) indispensable. But in order to tackle the many stamps with the earlier letters lost he was forced to make a reverse index in the nominative case of the stamps from Oswald's list arranged according to the final two letters of the actual stamp. Owing to the frequency of endings like -VS, -IVS, -IS he has at these points expanded the index to give groups of three, four, or five terminal letters. In dealing with symbols and ligatured letters (p. 77) the author says a cross equals IT. None the less, it also equals TI, as indeed he recognizes on p. 6. Accordingly, CASTI, MODESTI, and TIT(I) ought to be grouped under the termination -TI (on p. 24), even if they may be allowed a cross-reference (on p. 77) under symbols.

Following the advice of some other archaeologists who had profited by using this new index, the author has had the

kindness and wisdom to print this reverse index, and it will undoubtedly prove an invaluable and time-saving aid to all those who seek to identify potters' stamps on this ware. In a more specialized field it provides an extensive survey in reverse of Celtic names for epigraphists who have to restore incomplete names and can thus gain valuable clues before embarking on a more detailed search in Holder's *Altceltischer Sprachschatz*.

R. P. WRIGHT

University of Durham

ALAN ROWE: *Cyrenaican Expedition of the University of Manchester, 1952*. With contributions by Derek Buttle and John Gray. Pp. xi+59; 6 plates, 13 figs. Manchester: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 25s. net.

THIS, to put it kindly, is a scrappy account of a scrappy exploration of Cyrene and its surroundings. Rowe offers one specimen of each of several types of tombs, some of which he excavated incompletely. It would have been useful to have had more information about their details, setting, and frequency instead of a half-digested excursus on the tumuli of Asia Minor and Etruria. The evidence for dating is not presented satisfactorily and the reader is expected to take too much on trust. The illustrations are simple and clear, though some are cramped. Three incidental questions that puzzle me are whether M. 5 of Fig. 5 might not have had a superstructure, how much pre-Ptolemaic architecture there is in Alexandria (p. 20, n. 6), and why Rowe has chosen to ignore J. Cassels' much more serious study of tombs at Cyrene (*B.S.R.* xxiii, 1-43), of which he must have known.

Buttle's architectural chapter is thoughtful and makes some interesting comments on the planning of the city and the Doric sobriety of its public buildings, though that is usual enough in Hellenistic work. But the form of the half-column is notable. The plan, Fig. 13, is useful and neat, except for the typed labels spattered over it.

Gray examines principally some epitaphs at Tocra. These, though in Greek, are evidently Jewish and dated, so he plausibly argues, by the era of Actium. The sloppy sketches and careless commentary in themselves arouse distrust (note 'Nicaïos' in no. 2 and the arithmetic of p. 55, ll. 3-4), and a competent epigraphist warns me that Gray's transcriptions are often incorrect. As for the monogram on p. 59 a less gullible doctor

might have thought $\chi\alpha\pi\tau\omega\nu$ more likely than 'Jesus Christos, aleph and omega'.

It seems a pity that so much money should have been spent on this expedition. Still, it has done no harm to the site.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge

SEMNI KAROUZOU: *The Amasis Painter*. Pp. xii+46; 44 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 75s. net.

THE Amasis painter, one of the three chief painters of Attic black-figure pottery in its mature stage, has been known for nearly 130 years. Before the end of the nineteenth century his historical position had been clearly recognized by the more advanced students, though since they were obsessed by Panionism they detected an Ionian character in his style, as well as in the name Amasis. Their inquiries start from the black-figure pots, so far eight in number, which are signed by Amasis as 'maker' and painted by one hand. To these before the First World War rather more than a dozen unsigned pieces had been correctly added, though Pfuhl in 1923 acknowledged only two. Now the total of unsigned attributions is almost ninety, of which over half have been made by Beazley. A new study of the painter was due.

Mrs. Karouzou's monograph was ready in 1939. A consolation for the delay in its publication is that she has been able to bring it up to date. The Amasis painter, she explains, was active from about 555 to 525 B.C., and his work may be divided into three periods, of which the third is short (cf. p. 11, ll. 27-29). In his first period, when his favourite shape was the simpler one-piece amphora (type B), he was forming his style and improving his composition. His second period, prolific in *olpai*, is elegantly mature. His third shows a more dramatic composition and new refinements in detail, at least on his best work. In origin the Amasis painter was most likely a pupil of Clitias, the painter of the François vase. He, rather than Exekias, first framed the panels on amphorae. Finally, he contributed to the creation of the red-figure style.

Since our knowledge of the development and relations of the Amasis painter depends entirely on the analysis of his style, opinions are bound to differ. But Mrs. Karouzou is well qualified by her knowledge and appreciation; and in general her conclusions

are reasonable and sound. In her attributions she agrees completely with Beazley, though she differs a little in relative dating. Perhaps it is a slip when she implies that the plaque, no. 78, is a late work. She is probably right to put at about 525 B.C. the Boston amphora with the Struggle for the Tripod (no. 23); Beazley (*Dev.*, p. 58) seems to prefer a considerably later time. But there are several disputable datings: to take an obvious instance, can no. 5 be much earlier than no. 2? It had been recognized before 1900 that the Amasis painter had little effect on the development of Attic vase-painting, and it is hard to believe now that he had any active part in founding the red-figure style. The very early red-figure cup with the fragments of an inscription AMA . . . and E . . . (p. 38) has according to Beazley (*A.B.V.*, p. 158) no connexion in style with the Amasis painter; and though the neck-amphora in Boston (no. 23) is related to early red-figure, the impression it gives me is rather that of an old bottle that cannot hold the new wine.

Whether the Amasis painter usually shaped the pots he painted remains uncertain. For some pots of the same shape a single hand is very probable, and it is credible because of their general character and likely from the ordinary practice of potters that shaper and painter were the same man. But since there are few true profiles of shapes available, Mrs. Karouzou is wise not to commit herself. Another question is whether Amasis, the maker, was indeed either shaper or painter: Mrs. Karouzou agrees with Beazley that *ἐποίησε* usually refers to shaping, but this is an opinion that has not been and perhaps cannot be demonstrated.

To come down to details, the chronology of Fikellura is not sure enough to allow the assertion that handle spirals occur there earlier than in Attic (p. 38). The oenochoe made by Colchos (p. 6, n. 1) is commonly accepted as painted by Lydos. P. 16, l. 2, etc.: I am not convinced that the flanking drapery is the lining of the himation. P. 20, ll. 13-14 and pl. 35. 1: in the illustration I cannot see Apollo's finger on the handle nor do I understand how it could be there, since it is his left hand that grips the leg of the tripod. P. 36, no. 68: the inscription *Ἀφαιὸς ἐποίησεν* should be added. P. 20, bottom: read 'XXXV. 3'. P. 41, l. 1: read 'no. 54'.

The illustrations are excellent for quality and relevance, though regrettably their scale is not stated. The lucid text is admirably translated by T. J. Dunbabin. The production of the book is attractive. Mrs. Karouzou

deserves our gratitude for this scholarly and valuable study.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

G. M. A. RICHTER: *Catalogue of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*. Pp. 77; 27 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 40s. net.

THIS volume contains a detailed and handsomely illustrated catalogue of forty-seven ancient objects belonging to Harvard University and preserved in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection at Washington. Two are Achaemenian limestone reliefs of c. 500 B.C. (Nos. 1, 2), showing Greek influence; and two of the bronzes (Nos. 15, 25) are probably sub-classical in date. But the rest are Greek or Roman; and of these only three (Nos. 3, 14, 33) are definitely earlier than the Roman age. It is, then, to students of late-Hellenistic and imperial art that this small, but choice, assemblage of material will make its chief appeal.

Such students will find here a varied range of interesting items—in stone, bronze, silver, lead, pottery, and glass, together with a couple of paintings and seven floor-mosaics. Some of them are already familiar and well published (e.g. Nos. 4, 12, 17, 38-44). But the majority either are little known or are described and illustrated for the first time in this book; and special mention may be made of Nos. 9 (stone portrait-head of a Constantinian man in Julio-Claudian-to-Trajanic style), 10 (chalcedony head of a child), 11 (chalcedony cameo with portraits of Diocletian and Maximian), 19 (bronze jug with relief-decoration and silver incrustations), 34 (terra-cotta jar with figures in relief), and 47 (blue glass cameo of Augustus and Roma cast from the famous Vienna chalcedony). The case for the antiquity of the last-mentioned item is convincingly argued both in the text and in an appendix.

On the views expressed by Dr. Richter only a few comments can be made. Her main contribution to the notorious and still unresolved Menander-Virgil controversy (pp. 4-10) is to note that the squint, attributed to Menander by Suidas, is actually suggested in the Dumbarton Oaks and some other versions of the head; and it is as a definite 'Menanderite' that she emerges. It is not

easy to agree that the HV in the very fragmentary inscription found at Piazza Armerina has really 'strengthened' the identification as Maximian of the chief personage depicted in the mosaics (p. 17). Is 'ovoid' the right description of the black cushion-shaped areas between the white rosettes on one of the Antioch mosaic pavements (p. 57, pl. xxiv, A)? And could not that design be equally well characterized as one of interlacing circles?

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

Newnham College,
Cambridge

MARTIN HÜRLIMANN: *Athens*. With introductory text by REX WARNER. Pp. 118; 74 figs. in photogravure, 5 coloured plates. London: Thames & Hudson, 1956. Cloth, 25s. net.

REX WARNER and MARTIN HÜRLIMANN: *Eternal Greece*. Pp. 168; 92 figs. in photogravure, 1 coloured plate. London: Thames & Hudson, 1953. Cloth, 42s. net.

HERE are two more picture-books of Greece. Though by the same photographer and the same librettist they differ greatly in character and quality.

Athens has a compact subject which can be illustrated fairly in eighty photographs. To western visitors it is the ancient remains and of these the ruins of the Acropolis that are most impressive. Dr. Hürlimann shares or respects their views. He gives a few photographs of the lower town (using the Theseum to relieve the monotony of the Agora) and adds three of Sunion and one, discreetly unrevealing, of Eleusis. Two dozen illustrations of ancient sculpture and vases provide for the museums: of these Fig. 74 shows a relief that is new to many archaeologists. The Byzantine period is acknowledged by six views of churches, and the modern by as many of the inevitable Evzones, peasants, the Piraeus, and—a pleasant surprise—the Palace and the Academy. Hürlimann is too assured to avoid the obvious, if it is the best, and one of the pleasures of this book is the

familiarity of many of his pictures. The standard of photography is high, especially for outside views. Perhaps Fig. 6 may be criticized for its lighting; which makes the wall above the doors of the Propylaea appear to protrude between the columns in front; and the coloured plates, though possibly close enough to the colours of the days on which the photographs were taken, have (like Edward Lear's water-colours) an effect that is more typical of England than Greece. The descriptions accompanying each figure are concise and well judged, though classical scholars may shake their heads at some errors, mostly verbal. The plan (pp. 64-65) is unworthy, and 'walls in course of erection' is wrong. Mr. Warner has contributed a short introduction that may be helpful to readers who are not Hellenists. *Athens* is an excellent work, which should appeal to those interested in ancient Athens, whether they have been there or not.

Eternal Greece both sounds and is more pretentious. Of its ninety-odd illustrations less than half are views. The Acropolis has fifteen, Olympia and Delphi four each, lower Athens, Sunion, Mycenae three, Delos two, and Eleusis, Aegina, Corinth, Epidaurus, Naxos, Chaeronea, and Mount Olympus one apiece. The standard of photography or perhaps reproduction is not always as high as in *Athens*, and some of the views do not look to be recent. The remainder of the illustrations are devoted to sculpture, in which Dr. Hürlimann's taste is evidently for Archaic and Early Classical. Here some of the photographs are excellent, others disappointing. Partly this is because as they stand in museums the statues are badly placed and lighted, but the remarkable difference between the two aspects of the easily portable head on pp. 48-49 suggests that Hürlimann's conception of Greek sculpture is uncertain. Though there is much to admire in the photography of this book, the total effect is disjointed. For the text Warner is wholly responsible. It consists of discursive essays on and off the subject of the plates and is designed to please rather than to edify his admirers.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

DIONISO

XIX (NUOVA SERIE), FASC. I-2
(1956)

Q. Cataudella, *Francesco Guglielmino*: part of a commemorative address delivered in the University of Catania. A. Colonna, *Il volto di Elettra nel dramma di Sofocle*: vv. 1309-13 are explained in terms of the fixed expression of the mask. A. Garyza, *Studi sugli Eracclidi di Euripide*: the play's dramatic faults are not such as to need explanation by assuming lacunae. It has unity as an expression of the *hybris*-theme, and in virtue of its pervasive atmosphere of suspense and alarm. The character of Demophon, the part played by the Heraclidae in their own preservation, and the chorus's compromise with Alcmena are a criticism of exaggerated popular idealization of Athens. L. Senzasono, *Eschilo in Aristofane*: Aristophanes has a closer moral and artistic affinity with Aeschylus than with Euripides; he understands the influence of art on history, and assesses the value of Aeschylus' work from this standpoint. G. Rambelli, *Studi plautini: I, Asinaria*: the inconsistencies of plot and character in this play do not derive from Demophilus' 'Ova-yós'; they can be explained by assuming that part of Diabolus' original role has been given to Argyrippus, and that a scene of the 'Ova-yós has been omitted and two scenes (iii. 1 and 3) added from a second model. M. L. Orsini, *La cronologia dell' Encomio di Elena di Gorgia e Le Troiane di Euripide*: the question of priority is settled by the fact that in certain passages Euripides seems to refute the arguments of Gorgias, which could not therefore have been put forward in their existing form after the performance of the *Troades*. B. Stumbo, *Il Filottete di Sofocle*: reviews the play under various aspects, including character and plot, political allusions, the popular basis of the story, philosophical and Orphic elements in its treatment. To Sophocles Chryse was an island; the goddess, unnamed by him, is probably a survival of the Cretan snake-goddess. A. Pertusi, *Selezione teatrale e scelta erudita nella tradizione del testo di Euripide*: examines the evidence for the influence of popularity and frequency of performance on the early history of the Euripidean corpus; the groups

of nine and of ten plays are selections from the repertories popular in the fourth to third centuries and from the third century onward respectively (to be continued). G. L. Luzzatto, *Quattro traduttori tedeschi di Eschilo*: a comparison of the translations by Franz Stoessl, Johann Gustav Droysen, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Friedrich Leopold Stolberg.

ERANOS LIV (1956)

(In memory of Gudmund Björck)

L. R. Palmer, *Notes on the Personnel of the O-KA Tablets (Pylos 1952)*: recognizes a number of known and unknown Greek personal names, on the basis of which he argues that Ἀχιλλεύς is Greek, a hypocoristic of *Ἀχι-λαῖος. Nestor and his father Neleus both derive their names from *Nehelafos*, found at Pylos. J. Puhvel, *Une tablette de Pylos (Eq Ol)*: attempts an interpretation of several groups of signs. J. T. Kakridis, *The Role of the Woman in the Iliad*: argues that poetic convention assigns women negative functions, particularly that of attempting to restrain their menfolk, whose greatness is magnified by overcoming the restraint. R. Krarup, *Homer and the Art of Writing*: speculates on the first use of writing to record epic poetry. T. B. L. Webster, *Early and Late in Homeric Diction*: tries to distinguish three stages: Mycenaean, pre-migration, post-migration. He finds that the similes contain no unusual proportion of recognizably post-migration forms, and argues that some short similes, e.g. λέων ὤς, θεὸς ὤς, are Mycenaean. He remarks that old matter may show a high concentration of late forms if it has been abbreviated by a late poet. O. Regenbogen, *Gedanken zum Homerischen Apollon-Hymnus*: concludes that the original hymn ended at 178, that 207-544 are an alternative version, into which 300-74 are a later insertion.

K. Latte, *Die Lebenszeit der Korinna*: argues that word-forms, syntax, and style all support, like the ancient references, a fifth-century floruit. L. Bergson, *Eine Bemerkung zur Ökonomie der poetischen Kunstsprache*: argues that ornamental epithets are an exception to the rule that poets chose between metrically equivalent 'synonyms' on grounds of style or connotation. This cannot be the reason why ποδάρκης replaces ποδώκης in one

formul
someti
Festug
Parodo
64-166
domin
Bacchi
the last
thon:
style f
dies, 4
with th
ity. S.
from
Demos
inclini
school
I. Dü
Century
Aristo
been f
and cr
G. I.
ποσίās
49.6 a
καὶ ὅς
vii. 2
xxv. 1
ἀποασ
ἡσαν
from
G. K.
gives
Coloss
flesh,
Rieser
the vic
of the
collec
A. Da
shows
35 ff.
Tactic
the A
manu
des V
lustra
μεθα
φαμέν
work
verb
of ge
Altäre
Hepd
publi
dedic
Apul
scrips
the r
secula
than

formula alone, or why a ship or night is sometimes *κελαυή*, sometimes *μέλανα*. A. J. Festugière, *La signification religieuse de la Parodos des Bacchantes*: shows that *Bacchae* 64-169 follows the form of a cult-hymn (the dominant *ionic a minore* has associations with Bacchic cult); examines the implications of the language. I. Waern, *Zum Tragiker Agathon*: protests against judging Agathon's style from Aristophanes' and Plato's parodies, and examines the extant fragments, with the conclusion that he had little originality. S. Eitrem and L. Amundsen publish from a papyrus an inferior redaction of Demosthenes, *Epistula* ii. 18-20, 23-25; they incline to think it a product of the rhetorical schools rather than Demosthenes' own draft. I. Düring, *Aristotle and Plato in the mid-Fourth Century*: maintains that what is known of Aristotle's early works shows him to have been from the first an independent thinker and critic of Platonism.

G. Bendz proposes *δλυγοσιτίας* (for *δλυγοσιτίας*) and *δδρποσιτίας* in Soranus, *Gyn.* ii. 49. 6 and *δλυγοσιτία* (Wellman for *δλυγοσιτία*) and *δδρποσιτία* (for *δδρποσιτία*) in Aretaeus vii. 2. 14. A. Wifstrand, *Apostelgeschichte*, xxv. 13: explains *κατήγησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν ἀσπασμένοι τὸν Φῆστον ἀς κατήγησαν . . . καὶ ἡσπασάντο*, illustrating this construction from the first century B.C. to the tenth A.D. G. Karlsson, *Formelhafte in Paulusbriefen?*: gives parallels from epistolographers for Colossians ii. 5, 'though I be absent in the flesh, yet I am with you in the spirit'. H. Riesenfeld, *Das Brot von den Bergen*: rejects the view that *Didache* 9. 4 refers to the miracle of the loaves and fishes, seeing an inconsistent collection of conventional Jewish symbols. A. Dain, *L'Extrait nautique* tiré de Léon vi: shows this extract (Dain, *Naumachica*, pp. 35 ff.) to be of importance for the text of the *Tactica*, as being a better representative of the Ambrosian tradition than any complete manuscript. H. Zilliacus, *Zur Umschreibung des Verbums in spätgriechischen Urkunden*: illustrates the growth of verbiage, e.g. *φανόμεθα γράμμασιν χρησάμενοι πρὸς σε* for *ἐγγράψαμέν σοι*, remarking on the tendency, at work even in early Greek, to substitute for a verb an abstract noun and a colourless verb of general meaning. M. P. Nilsson, *Zwei Altäre aus Pergamon*: uses the notes of Prof. Hepding from the campaigns of 1912-13 to publish two altars: one is Jewish, the other dedicated by a *βωμοφύρος* (a new word), cf. *Apul. Met.* xi. 10. S. Y. Rudberg, *Les manuscrits à contenu profane du Mont-Athos*: gives the results of a visit. There are some 600 secular Greek manuscripts, almost all later than 1600, often copies of printed editions.

He lists the earlier manuscripts and thinks that there are manuscripts of Aristides, Dio Cassius, Dioscorides, Epictetus, Galen, Josephus, Libanius, Lucian, Procopius, and Strabo that might be worth collating.

T. Kleberg, *Les Ménèches de Plaute*, vv. 110 sqq.: argues that *amatores mariti* means 'partisans of the husband'. E. Fraenkel, *Eine Form römischer Kriegsbuletin*: gives examples of military events recorded in brief sentences in asyndeton, the verb at the end. J. Svennung, *Vergil Aeneis* 6, 96: rejects *quam* as nonsense, and supports by parallels the reading *contra audientior ito qua tua te fortuna sinet*. A. Boethius, *Liuy* 8, 10, 12 and the *Warrior Image from Capistrano*: agrees that the figure is that of a *devotus*, and considers the style to belong to a local Adriatic culture with Illyrian affinities. S. A. Blomgren, *Ad Valerium Maximum Adnotationes Criticae*: dealing with i. 1. 4, i. 1. 11, i. 7. 2, ii. 5. 5, ii. 6. 5, iii. 2. 23, v. 2. 6, vi ext. 1. 2, viii. 4. 2, has useful collections of material for Valerius' Latinity. E. Wistrand, *Ad Columellae ix librum adnotationes*: proposes *opes* for *opes* at 15. 3, to retain *ut* at 1. 2, and a repunctuation at 15. 4. J. Marouzeau, *Juppiter Optimus* et 'Bona Dea': the adjectives originally implied excellence and power, not benevolence. G. Dumézil, *Le curus equos de la fête de Pales et la mutilation de la jument Vis-palā*: insists that the use at the Parilia of blood from the October horse's tail is mere conjecture: some other *ad hoc* horse is more likely. He suggests that the mare *Vis-palā*, which in the *Rigveda* suffers the loss of a leg, may be relevant. A. Josephson, *Terrae filius*: discusses the origins of this term and the similar *Neptuni filius*; he deals with the phrase *ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης*. A. Nelson, *Equitium et dies artificialis dans le 'latin médiéval finlandais'*: disposes of the 'new' meanings assigned to these terms by R. Hakamies, *Neuphil. Mitt.* lvi (1955), 1 ff.

MNEMOSYNE

4th SERIES, X (1957), FASC. I

J. Gonda, *Greek ἐνι+Dative*: the dat. after *ἐνι*, which is mostly instrumental or local in origin, should in some phrases be derived rather from a true dat., e.g. *ἐνι δόρπῳ* 'for supper', originally dat. of purpose or object in view. G. J. de Vries, *Pindar's Mood*: there has been too much tendency of late to stress P.'s pessimism: his deepest happiness is not impaired by having tasted the bitterness of life. J. H. C. Kern, *An Attic 'Feeding Bottle' of the 4th Century B.C. in Leyden*: this small vase from Cyrenaica, with handle and spout, has at least twenty-four parallels, ten of them

from Egypt; some may be feeding-bottles or toys, some may have served as lamp-fillers; perhaps all were made in Attica. K. Büchner, *Dichtung und Grammatik*: Hor. *Epod.* xvi. 15 f., *forte quid expedit communiter aut melior pars | malis carere quaeritis laboribus*, is to be explained as hyperbaton, 'fortasse quaeritis (communiter, etc.) quid expedit . . .', and not, as by Axelsson in *Ut Pictura Poesis* (Festschr. Enk), as *forte quid expedit!* 'etwas Tapferes möge nützen!'; *expedit* means not 'avails' but 'frees', and *carere* is a consecutive inf.; poets can take liberties with grammar, and H. is free with his use of the inf. J. H. Loenen, *Albinus' Metaphysics. An Attempt at Rehabilitation*: the resemblances between A. and Apuleius are not so great that we can assume A. borrowed all essentials from Gaius; he did borrow from Arius Didymus, but perhaps only incidentally, and not through him from Antiochus; Antiochus introduced into Platonism the concept of the ideas as thoughts of God, and A. transferred this to the level of the transcendent God; on the dualism between God and world-soul he shows not only agreements with, but divergences from, Plutarch; in his concept of God's causality he seems to be influenced by Plutarch; he is not an eclectic, his philosophy represents more than a transitional phase, and he is more original than most scholars allow. B. A. van Groningen, *Ad Aristophanis Gerytadae Fr. 149*: punctuate l. 7 $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\ \gamma'$. (A) $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \Theta\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\phi\omicron\iota\tau\alpha\iota$; (B) $\pi\alpha\nu\tau'$ $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. P. Brommer-W. K. Kraak, *Notes sur Verg. Aen. i. 393-400: terras capere*, of swans, means not swooping down from a height but coming from a distance (B.), and landing not on but near a shore (K.). W. J. W. Koster, *δερμορραφιον*: a scholium on Ar. *Plut.* 301 $\sigma\phi\eta\kappa\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, read by ultraviolet rays, ends with this word.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE

XXXI. 1 (1957)

L. Robert, *Une épigramme de Carie*: revised text, with full commentary, of an inscription found at Kazykly near Iasus (now Peek, *Versinschriften*, no. 1144), a metrical epitaph on a vine-grower. P. Courcelle, *Antécédents autobiographiques des Confessions de Saint Augustin*: examines Augustine's relation to his predecessors, especially Cyprian, *Ad Donatum*, and Hilary, *De Trinitate*. F. Lasserre, *Les premiers poèmes d'Archiloque*: attempts to establish the chronology of frs. 62. 7, 74. 22. and P. Oxy. 2310. P. Louis, $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$: γ . is a horse or ass dwarfed by a pre-natal accident; Aristotle uses it, for lack of a special term,

for the offspring of mule and mare. R. Martin, *Sur deux expressions techniques de l'architecture grecque*: (1) Ar. *Met.* 50. 2, $\delta\chi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\omega\pi\omicron\iota$ were open conduits (opposed to $\delta\pi\omicron\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$; cf. Herod. ii. 148); (2) Aristoph. *Thesm.* 395, $\iota\kappa\pi\iota\alpha$ refers not to the theatre of Dionysus, which had a stone auditorium at the end of the fifth century, but to temporary wooden structures for meetings in the agora or on the Phryx.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

XCIX. 3 (1956)

O. Skutsch, *Zu Vergils Eklogen*: E. 6 is a catalogue of Alexandrian themes to be treated in preference to heroic themes; the *Ringbildung* in the *Eclogues* postulated by Maury exists, but it is doubtful whether it was intended; Daphnis in E. 5 is not Caesar; parenthetic apposition (e.g. i. 57) is perhaps an imitation of the style of Gallus. O. Becker, *Über eine schwer erklärbare Stelle im platonischen Höhlengleichnis*: at Rep. vii. 514 c 1, for $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\eta\ \tau\epsilon$ read $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\eta\ \gamma\epsilon$. E. W. Handley, *Words for 'soul', 'heart', and 'mind' in Aristophanes*: studies the use of $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, $\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$, $\phi\eta\eta\iota\iota\phi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$, and $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and concludes that they were words little used in everyday speech and therefore suitable material for A. owing to the associations they had with serious poetry and especially with Euripides. A. Kurfess, *Zum V. Buch der Oracula Sibyllina*: comments with emendations on six passages. R. Kassel, *Reste eines hellenistischen Spätmacherbuches auf einem Heidelberger Papyrus?* compares Ar. *lyr.*² (Diehl) suppl. (1942) pp. 66-68, with Hor. *Sat.* i. 5. 56 sqq. V. Coulon, *Observations critiques et exégétiques sur divers passages d'auteurs latins et grecs*: at Lucret. iii. 962 read *gnaris*; Cic. *T.D.* i. 113 in *usu* (with Sydow); Catull. 10. 26 *commoda* is imperative; Plut. *Mor.* 438 a 3 read $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\rho\mu\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$; 438 d 4 $\epsilon\zeta\eta\varsigma$; Ar. *Lysistrata* 1218 read $\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu$ (with van Leeuwen), attribute 1273-8 (with van Leeuwen) and 1295 (with Bergk) to Lysistrata; Soph. *Ant.* 782 $\kappa\tau\eta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ = 'prey', 784 $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\eta\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ = 'lie in ambush', 614 read $\mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ and take it as adverbial; translate Ar. *Ran.* 1531 literally. J. Hejnie, *Clodius Auctor: Ein Beitrag zur sog. Sallustian Invektive*: Clodius composed the pamphlet in 53. It was published (perhaps by Sallust) in 52 after Clodius' death. W. Speyer, *Zur Verschwörung des Cn. Cornelius Cinna*: accepts the historicity of Cinna's conspiracy, for which the only source is Seneca, who adapted details to suit his rhetorical purpose and so misled Cassius Dio. J. Willis, *Marklandi Annotationes in Ausonium ineditae*: publishes notes

found in a copy of the 1671 edition of Ausonius printed by Joannes Blaeu.

XCIX. 4. (1956)

O. Becker, *Über den Κυρνεύων λόγος des Diodoros Kronos*: the ancient Megarians came much nearer the modern thinker, N. Hartmann, than the latter believed: for instance, 'Megarian Possibility' is identical with his *Realmöglichkeit*. N. P. Miller, *The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus: A Reconsideration*: discrepancies in the methods of developing substantially identical arguments are permissible variations, given the difference of style of Claudius and Tacitus and the conventions of ancient historiography. M. Mühl, *Solon gegen Peisistratos: Ein Beitrag zur peripatetischen Geschichtsschreibung*: Phacnias of Eresus is the source of Plut. Sol. 30, Heraclides of c. 31: the historical Solon must have opposed the Tyranny, but these anecdotes are part of the Solon-Legend. H. Hommel, *Die trojanische Herkunft der Franken*: belief in a Trojan origin can be traced to mispronunciation of the title *colonia Traiana* as *c. Troiana*, and to a misunderstanding of the title *fratres consanguineique populi Romani*. E. Bickel, *Caesar Augustus als Achilles bei Vergil Horaz Properz*: Achilles at Prop. ii. 1. 37, is an allegory for Augustus, suggested by Virg. E. 4. 36. The same identification is intended by Horace, Odes i. 37. 19-20. H. Erbse, *Zu den olynthischen Reden des Demosthenes*: the speeches form an artistic whole resulting from a single inspiration; ii and iii have no reference to a particular situation. E. Bickel, *Zum Maecenas-Epigramm in Suetons Horazvita*: approves the emendation <Tithono> of W. Noetzel, *Gymn.* lxiv (1957), 27.

C. 1 (1957)

E. Bickel, *C. Caesar L.F.*: identifies the character in Cic. *de Or.* and the critic of Terence in Cic. *ap. Suet. Vit. Ter.* 7, pp. 33 ff. Reiff. (pp. 8 ff. Wessner) with C. Caesar L. f. (died 87 B.C.) and collects his few verse and prose fragments. W. Jaeger, *Ein verkanntes Fragment des Parmenides*: attributes to Parmenides the view quoted by Aristotle, *Met. Z* 15. 1040^a 27 ff. S. Eitrem, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu zwei Briefen Kaiser Julians*: at ep. 60 read εἶτα <τὰ> τῆς ὁρμῆς ἀναστειλάντες τῆς παραχρήμα, βεβουλευμένους . . ., at ep. 59 read <'Ire>, ὥσπερ εἰς τὰς τροφάς, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐκτὸς κόσμον συμβάλλεσθε. O. Skutsch, *Der zweite Schluß der Andria*: studies the tradition and text of the scene, but finds no conclusive evidence for dating. B. Marzullo, *La Chioma di Neobule*: rejects the linking of the two fragments forming Archilochus fr. 25 D.³, refers them not to Neobule but to an unknown ἐραῖπα. Line 4 derives from the Homeric formula in, for example, *Il.* xvi. 791. A. von Gerkan, *Zur Frühgeschichte Roms*, argues, against Gjerstad, that the archaeological evidence does not conflict with the traditional account of events and dates in early Roman History. E. Bickel, *μετασχηματίζεσθαι: ein übersehener Grundbegriff des Poseidonios*: Seneca's use of *transfigurare* represents the Platonic use of *μετασχηματίζω* as adopted by Posidonius. R. Merkelbach, *Heliodor i. 10, Seneca und Euripides*: at *Hel.* i. 10. 2 (p. 13. 11 Bekker), read ὁ <ἐμὸς> | Ἰννὸδῶρος, ὁ Θηραῖος ὁ <νέος>. P. Maas, *Leonidas, Anth. Pal.* 6. 221. 7 sq.: in line 8 read ἐπ' ἄλλο σῖνος. L. Wickert, *Zum Christenbrief des Plinius: Ep.* x. 96. 10, read *passimque prosicem venire victimarum, cuius . . .*

NOTES AND NEWS

A correspondent writes:

'THE 53rd Annual General Meeting of the Classical Association was held in the two University towns of Durham and Newcastle upon Tyne, 9-13 April 1957. When the Association last met there, in 1920, the President-elect was the eminent banker, Dr. Walter Leaf, so that there was a certain appropriateness in having as President this year, for the second time, a notable figure in the world of business, Mr. John Spedan Lewis, co-founder of the John Lewis Partnership. In his Address, delivered with great vigour, he related the ideals of that Partnership to the ancient world, particularly to events in Athenian history, and such terms as *σευσάχθεια*, *παρρησία*, and *ισηγورία* found their relevance in a modern setting.

A very varied fare was offered in the papers read. Professor G. B. A. Fletcher

contrasted Ovid's methods of portrayal of character in the *Metamorphoses* with those of other poets, especially Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Virgil. Another penetrating study of characterization, in Seneca's tragedies, was made by Mr. Charles Garton. Mr. J. S. Morrison considered the reasons for Plato's varying attitude to the relation of philosophy with politics, and Dr. T. J. Cadoux combined the celebration of two anniversaries by discussing the legal issue involved in Julius Caesar's recall by the Senate, as first enunciated by Mommsen in 1857, in this the bimillenary year of Caesar's death. Mr. N. E. Collinge examined in detail problems facing Greek poets in the use of dialectical forms, covering a very wide field in his survey. Even the two lantern lectures, in addition to being interestingly descriptive, had each a novel thesis to maintain, Dr. L. A. Moritz making a good case for the lateness of the introduction of the rotary mill and Mr. R. T. Williams suggesting that they were two-level ships which Ameinocles built for the Samians (Thuc. i. 13). Eleven short papers were offered and all heard in a breathless session of 'Communications'.

A whole day was devoted to an expedition, under the expert guidance of Professor I. A. Richmond, to the Roman Wall, where, on the bleak hill-top at Housesteads, a shower of snow came not amiss as illustrating the rigours of garrison life in Roman Britain. Another enjoyable visit was that made to the Cathedral and conventual buildings of Durham.

The seventh International Congress of Classical Archaeology will be held in September 1958, from the 6th to the 8th in Rome and from the 9th to the 13th in Naples; it is intended that the programme should mainly deal with recent unpublished discoveries. Visits to excavations will be arranged during the Congress and a whole day will be spent at Pompeii. At the end of the Congress members of it will have the opportunity of taking part in excursions to Sicily, Etruria, and Northern Italy. Further information may be obtained from the Secretary (Professor P. Romanelli), 49 Piazza S. Marco, Rome.

The third International Congress of Classical Studies will be held in London from 31 August to 5 September 1959.

The first volume of a new classical journal for Portugal and Brazil, *Euphrosyne*, has appeared under the editorship of Professor F. Rebelo Gonçalves of the University of Lisbon. The journal is intended to be biennial: the price of vol. i is Esc. 15.

The first fascicle of the new *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from A.D. 800 to 1200*, undertaken by the International Union of Academies, has now been published: it contains the letter L, edited by Professor Franz Blatt of Aarhus. The Index Scriptorum, a list of texts cited and editions used, has been published at the same time.

The Czech *Listy Filologické*, this year an octogenarian, which publishes its articles (and reviews) in Czech, with short summaries in French, German, English, or Latin, is now accompanied by a separate supplement, under the title of *Eunomia*, containing articles written in these languages.

The quarterly *Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis* (Berlin: Academie-Verlag), which has completed its first year, consists of German abstracts of works on classical

studies
slovakia

The
interna
bibliog
English

The
Athrony
Emrys
volume

Low
fluence
peared

Exc

Adelson

Byza

Seve

and

plate

Soci

Anton

tran

ledg

Barker

Byz

Pal

wri

troc

Oxi

305

Bassol

(Er

pp

Ma

cio

Becke

An

ser

ho

9.5

Becke

ke

dic

ra

Berov

Al

19

19

studies published in the Soviet Union and in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

The 1956 volume of *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* (xxvii/xxviii) is an international tribute to the memory of Giorgio Pasquali (1885-1952). A bibliography of Pasquali's work is prefixed to fifty-seven articles in Italian, English, French, and German.

The latest annual volume (xx) of the Welsh philosophical journal *Efryddiol Athronyddol* is a Platonic number presented by his fellow-countrymen to Sir Emrys Evans, whose Welsh translation of the *Republic* appeared last year. The volume contains five articles on Plato, all written by Welshmen in Welsh.

Lowes Dickinson's *The Greek Way of Life*, a book which has had a wide influence and has been reprinted many times in the last sixty years, has reappeared in a new edition with a short foreword by Mr. E. M. Forster.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Adelson** (H. L.) *Light Weight Solidi and Byzantine Trade during the Sixth and Seventh Centuries.* (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, 138.) Pp. ix+187; 14 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1957. Paper, \$5.
- Anton** (J. P.) *Aristotle's Theory of Contrariety.* Pp. xi+253. London: Routledge, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Barker** (E.) *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium from Justinian I to the last Palaeologus. Passages from Byzantine writers and documents translated with introduction and notes.* Pp. xvi+239. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Bassols de Climent** (M.) *Sintaxis latina.* (Enciclopedia Clásica, Nos. 3-4.) Vol. i: pp. xviii+408. Vol. ii: pp. xiii+456. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956. Cloth.
- Becker** (O.) *Das mathematische Denken der Antike.* (Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft.) Pp. 128. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1957. Paper, DM. 9.50.
- Becker** (O.) *Zwei Untersuchungen zur antiken Logik.* (Klassische-philologische Studien, Heft 17.) Pp. 55. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.
- Berze** (H.) *Dion.* (Akad. d. Wiss. in Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl., 1956. 10.) Pp. 135. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1957. Paper, DM. 10. 80.
- Blatt** (F.) (ed.) (1) *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis ab anno dccc usque ad annum mcc.* L. Pp. 231. (2) *Index Scriptorum Mediae Latinitatis qui afferuntur in Novo Glossario.* Pp. 194. Copenhagen: Munksgaard (Cambridge: Heffer), 1957. Paper.
- Boehner** (P.) *Ockham: Philosophical Writings.* A selection edited and translated. (Nelson's Philosophical Classics.) Pp. lix+154. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1957. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Bömer** (F.) *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten.* Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert. Band i: Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung. Pp. 301. Heidelberg: Winter, 1957. Paper, DM. 25.
- Bowie** (S. P.) *Virgil: The Georgics.* A new translation. Pp. xxx+111. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1957. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Brock** (J. K.) *Fortetsa: Early Greek Tombs near Knossos.* Pp. xvii+224; 174 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. Cloth, £6. 16s. 6d. net.
- Bujaldon** (A. R.) *Ciceron: Segunda Acción contra Verres, Libro v: Los Suplicios.* Texto latino, traducción y notas. Pp. xvi+107. Mendoza, Argentine: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Instituto de Lenguas y Literaturas Clásicas, 1957. Paper.
- Bullick** (W. J.), *Harrison* (J. A.) *Concise Greek Course.* Pp. xii+161. London: Bell, 1957. Cloth, 10s.

- Clark* (D. L.) *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. Pp. xiii+285. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 36s. net.
- Cloché* (P.) *Un fondateur d'empire: Philippe II, roi de Macédoine*. Pp. 295. St. Étienne: Éditions Dumas, 1956. Paper, 800 fr.
- Cohn-Haft* (L.) *The Public Physicians of Ancient Greece*. (Smith College Studies in History, vol. xlii.) Pp. x+91. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College (Department of History), 1956. Paper, \$1.50.
- Crossley* (H.) *The Golden Sayings of Epicurus with the Hymn of Cleanthes*. Translated and arranged. (Golden Treasury Series.) Pp. xlii+190. London: Macmillan, 1957. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net. [Reprint: first published 1903.]
- Delebecque* (E.) *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*. (Études et Commentaires, 25.) Pp. 560. Paris: Klincksieck, 1957. Paper, 3,800 fr.
- Dickinson* (G. L.) *The Greek View of Life*. With a Foreword by E. M. Forster. Pp. xv+261. London: Methuen, 1957. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.
- Drerup* (H.) *Zum Ausstattungsluxus in der römischen Architektur*. (Orbis Antiquus.) Pp. 35; 7 plates. Münster, Westf.: Aschendorff, 1957. Paper, DM. 3.50.
- Edmonds* (J. M.) *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*. Edited, annotated, and translated. Vol. i. Pp. 1028. Leiden: Brill, 1957. Cloth, fl. 98.
- Ehrenberg* (V.) *Der Staat der Griechen*. Teil i: *Der hellenische Staat*. Pp. 122. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Cloth, DM. 9.
- Ernout* (A.) *Philologica*, II. (Textes et Commentaires, 26.) Pp. 255. Paris: Klincksieck, 1957. Paper, 2,400 fr.
- Ernout* (A.) *Recueil de textes latins archaïques*. Nouvelle édition. Pp. xii+289. Paris: Klincksieck, 1957. Paper.
- Estopañán* (S. C.) *Manual de Gramática Histórica Griega*. Vol. ix: *Lecciones de Sintaxis del Verbo y de las Oraciones*. Pp. lii+582. Barcelona: Editorial Herder, 1957.
- Ewan* (C.) *Caesar's Gallic War*, Book i. (Alpha Classics.) Pp. vii+148; 8 plates, map. London: Bell, 1957. Cloth, 5s.
- Ferguson* (J.) *Roma Aeterna: the Value of Classical Studies for the Twentieth Century*. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 12. Ibadan, Nigeria: University College, 1957. Paper.
- Fitts* (D.) *From the Greek Anthology*. Poems in English Paraphrase. Pp. 76. London: Faber, 1957. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Friezer* (E.) *De Ordening van Servius Tullius*. Pp. 143. The Hague: Uitgeverij Excelsior, 1957. Paper.
- Giancotti* (F.) *Cronologia dei Dialoghi di Seneca*. Pp. 363. Turin: Loescher, 1957. Paper.
- Graves* (R.) *Suetonius: The Twelve Caesars*, a new translation. Pp. 315. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1957. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Green* (P.) *The Sword of Pleasure*. [The Memoirs of Sulla: a Novel.] Pp. 314. London: Murray, 1957. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Grene* (D.), *Benardete* (S. G.) *Aeschylus: Seven against Thebes and Prometheus Bound translated and with introductions by D. G., Suppliant Maidens and Persians translated and with introductions by S.G.B. (The Complete Greek Tragedies)*. Pp. vii+179. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1957. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Hamm* (E. M.) *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*. (Abh. der deutschen Ak. der Wiss. zu Berlin, 1951. 2.) Pp. 234. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957. Paper, DM. 44.50.
- Havelock* (E. A.) *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics*. Pp. 443. London: Cape, 1957. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Heurgon* (J.) *Trois études sur le 'Ver sacrum'*. (Collection Latomus, xxvi.) Pp. 52. Brussels: Latomus, 1957. Paper, 80 B.f.
- Hubert* (C.), *Pohlenz* (M.) *Plutarchus: Moralia*. Vol. v, fasc. 1. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxx+142. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Cloth & boards, DM. 7.40.
- Jacoby* (F.) *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung von F. J. Zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag herausgegeben von H. Block*. Pp. xi+449. Leiden: Brill, 1956. Cloth, fl. 55.
- Jacoby* (F.) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Erster Teil: Neudruck. A: Vorrede — Text — Addenda — Konkordanz; Nr. 1-63. a: Kommentar — Nachträge; Nr. 1-63. 2 vols. Pp. xii+563+52*. Leiden: Brill, 1957. Cloth, 68 fl.
- Kajanto* (I.) *God and Fate in Livy*. (Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, ser. B, tom. 64.) Pp. 115. Turku: Turun Yliopiston Kustantama, 1957. Paper, mk. 400.
- Knoche* (U.) *Die römische Satire*. 2. Auflage. Pp. 122. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.40.
- Knox* (B. W. M.) *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles' Tragic Hero and his Time*. Pp. 280. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 35s. net.

- Koestermann, (E.) *Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt*. Post C. Halm-G. Andresen octavum edidit E. K. Tom. ii, fasc. 2: Germania, Agricola, Dialogus. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxxix+128. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Boards, DM. 5.
- Koskenniemi (H.) *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 102. 2.) Pp. 214. Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1956. Paper, 800 mk.
- Krarup (P.) *Cicero: De Re Publica*. Udvalg for Gymnasiet. Text: pp. 88. Notes: pp. 70. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1957. Paper.
- Lauffer (S.) *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*. Zweiter Teil: Gesellschaftliche Verhältnisse, Aufstände. Pp. 134. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1957. Paper, DM. 10.80.
- Laurand (L.), Lauras (A.) *Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines*. Tome i: Grèce: Rome (Géographie, Histoire, Institutions, Littérature, Grammaire, Historique, Métrique). Édition entièrement refondue. Pp. vii+676. Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1957. Paper.
- Lawrence (A. W.) *Greek Architecture*. (The Pelican History of Art.) Pp. xxiv+327; 152 plates, 171 figs. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Leeman (A. D.) *Aufbau und Absicht von Sallusts Bellum Iugurthinum*. (Med. der K. Nederl. Akad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, n.r., Deel 20, No. 8.) Pp. 33. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1957. Paper, fl. 2.
- Lejeune (M.) (ed.) *Études Mycéniennes: Actes du Colloque International sur les Textes Mycéniens, Gif-sur-Yvette, 3-7 avril 1956*. Pp. 280. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1956. Cloth, 2,000 fr.
- Lendle (O.) *Die Pandorassage bei Hesiod*. Textkritische und motivgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Pp. 140; 9 plates. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1957. Paper, DM. 4.80.
- Lenz (F. W.) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis*. Iterum edidit F. W. L. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum.) Pp. 187. Turin: Paravia, 1957. Paper, L. 1,400.
- Lenz (F. W.) *P. Ovidii Nasonis Halieutica—Fragmenta—Nux: incerti Consolatio ad Liviam*. Iterum edidit F. W. L. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum.) Pp. 214. Turin: Paravia, 1957. Paper, L. 1,400.
- Lesky (A.) *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Erste Lieferung: pp. 1-64; Zweite und dritte Lieferung: pp. 65-192; Vierte und fünfte Lieferung: pp. 193-320. Bern: Francke, 1957. Paper, 4.60, 9.20, 9.20 Sw.fr. [To be completed in 11 or 12 parts.]
- Lukasiewicz (J.) *Aristotle's Syllogistic from the Standpoint of Modern Formal Logic*. Second edition. Pp. xv+222. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Lyne (G. M.) *Personae Comicae*. Eight short classroom plays for junior forms. Pp. 48. Slough: Centaur Books, 1957. Paper, 2s.
- Maas (P.) *Textkritik*. 3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Pp. 34. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Paper, DM. 2.30.
- Magariños (G.) *Juvenal y su tercera satira*. (Manuales y Anejos de 'Emerita', xv.) Pp. 121. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956. Paper.
- Marg (W.) *Homer und die Dichtung*. (Orbis Antiquus, 11.) Pp. 44. Münster, Westf.: Aschendorff, 1957. Paper, DM. 2.80.
- Merkelbach (R.) *Die Hesiodfragmente auf Papyrus*. (Sonderausgabe aus Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Band xvi, Heft 1.) Pp. 55; 6 plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Paper, DM. 6.40.
- Metzger (B. M.) *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. Pp. xii+274. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Moon (B. E.) *Mycenaean Civilization: Publications since 1935*. A bibliography. (University of London Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement No. 3.) Pp. 77. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1957. Paper, 10s.
- Moraux (P.) *A la recherche de l'Aristote perdu: Le Dialogue 'Sur la Justice'*. Pp. xii+183. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957. Paper. 150 B. fr.
- Morris *Experientia: a modern practice book for 'O' level Latin*. Pp. 96. London: Harrap, 1957. Cloth, 5s.
- Munari (F.) *Catalogue of the MSS. of Ovid's Metamorphoses*. (University of London Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement No. 4.) Pp. 74. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1957. Paper, 10s.
- Music, New Oxford History of*. Vol. i: Ancient and Oriental Music. Edited by E. Wellesz. Pp. xxiii+530; 15 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Mylonas (G. E.) *Ancient Mycenae: the Capital City of Agamemnon*. Pp. ix+201; 87 ill. on plates. London: Routledge, 1957. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Narain (A. K.) *The Indo-Greeks*. Pp. xvi+201; 6 plates, 3 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 42s. net.

- Nash-Williams* (A. H.) *Advanced Level Greek Prose Composition*. Pp. xvii + 177. London: Macmillan, 1957. Cloth, 6s.
- Neuiger* (H. J.) *Metapher und Allegorie: Studien zu Aristophanes*. (Zetemata, Heft 16.) Pp. xiv + 185. Munich: Beck, 1957. Paper, DM. 18.
- Nicoll* (A.) *Chapman's Homer*. Edited with Introductions, Textual Notes, Commentaries and Glossaries. Vol. i: *The Iliad*. Vol. ii: *The Odyssey and the Lesser Homerica*. Pp. xxii + 740; xvi + 654. London: Routledge, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Nilsson* (M. P.) *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 8^e, v.) Pp. viii + 150; 44 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1957. Paper, Kr. 30.
- Oakley* (M.) *Virgil: The Aeneid*. A new translation. (Everyman's Library.) Pp. xvii + 298. London: Dent, 1957. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Paladini* (V.) *C. Sallusti Crispi Orationes et Epistulae de Historiarum libris excerptae*. Pp. 191. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1957. Paper.
- Peachey* (F.) *Clareti Enigmata: the Latin Riddles of Claret*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. (Folklore Studies, 7.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957. Paper, \$1.25.
- Pease* (A. S.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum liber primus*. Pp. viii + 537. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955 (1957), Cloth, 120s. net.
- Perl* (G.) *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzahlung*. (Deutsche Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin, Schr. der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 9.) Pp. vii + 174. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957. Paper, DM. 23.
- Plutarch's Lives*. The Dryden translation, revised by A. H. Clough. 3 vols. (Everyman Library.) Pp. xxvi + 546, 581, 520. London: Dent, 1957. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net each. [Published 1864; first published in this edition 1910.]
- Pocock* (L. G.) *The Sicilian Origin of the Odyssey*. A study of the topographical evidence. Pp. 74; 12 plates, 9 figs. Wellington, N.Z.: New Zealand University Press, 1957. Paper.
- Portalupi* (F.) *Sulla corrente rodiese*. (Univ. di Torino, Pubbl. della Fac. di Magistero, 7.) Pp. 28. Turin: Giappichelli, 1957. Paper, L. 400.
- Quacquarelli* (A.) *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Ad Scapulam. Prolegomeni, testo critico e commento*. (Opuscula Patrum, i.) Pp. 131. Rome: Desclée, 1957. Paper.
- Raby* (F. J. E.) *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*. Second edition. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 408; vii + 409. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 84s. net.
- Richmond* (I. A.) *The Archaeology of the Roman Empire: a Scheme of Study*. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 21. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Robinson* (R. S.) *Sources for the History of Greek Athletics*. In English translation with introduction, notes, bibliography and indices. Pp. xii + 289. Obtainable from Mrs. Robinson at 338 Probasco Street, Cincinnati 20, Ohio: \$4.25 post free.
- Rose* (H. J.) *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks*. Pp. ix + 202. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Ross* (W. D.) *Aristotelis Politica*. (Oxford Classical Texts.) Pp. x + 282. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Ruijgh* (C. J.) *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Pp. 178. Assen, Netherlands: van Gorcum, 1957. Paper, fl. 11.50.
- Sartori* (F.) *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese nel vi e v secolo a. C.* (Univ. di Padova, Pubbl. dell' Istituto di Storia Antica, vol. iii.) Pp. 169. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1957. Paper, L. 1,800.
- Schmitt* (H. H.) *Rom und Rhodos*. (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 40.) Pp. 224. Munich: Beck, 1957. Paper, DM. 22.50.
- Serafini* (A.) *Studio sulla satira di Giovenale*. Pp. xii + 441. Florence: Le Monnier, 1957. Paper, L. 4,000.
- Sicherl* (M.) *Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übersetzungen von Iamblichos "de Mysteriis"*. Eine kritisch-historische Studie. Pp. xvi + 226; 16 plates. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957. Paper, DM. 33.50.
- Sinnigen* (W. G.) *The Officium of the Urban Prefecture during the Latin Roman Empire*. (Papers and Monographs, xvii.) Pp. v + 123. Rome: American Academy, 1957. Paper.
- Skeat* (T. C.) *The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book-Production*. (From Proc. of the Brit. Acad., vol. xlii.) Pp. 30. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Smyth* (H. W.) *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. M. Messing. Pp. xviii + 784. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 80s. net.

- Silgen* (G.) Commentaire sur cinq Bucoliques de Virgile (3, 6, 8, 9, 10). Pp. 155. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1957. Paper.
- Strasburger* (G.) Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias. (Frankfurt Diss.) Pp. 142. Frankfurt, 1954. Paper.
- Strohm* (H.) Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form. (Zetemata, Heft 15.) Pp. vii+185. Munich: Beck, 1957. Paper, DM. 18.
- Taylor* (D.) Ancient Greece. (Methuen's Outlines.) Pp. 76; ill. London: Methuen, 1957. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Toynbee* (J. M. C.) The Flavian Reliefs from the Palazzo della Cancellaria in Rome. (Charlton Lectures on Art, King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne.) Pp. 24; 2 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.
- Traina* (A.) L'Alfabeto e la Pronunzia del Latino. Pp. 85. Bologna: Riccardo Pàtron, 1957. Paper, L. 900.
- Triantaphyllopoulos* (J. K.) Lex Cicercia: 'Εγγρητικά (Bürgerschaftsfragen). Pp. xix+150. Athens: Kleisiounis, 1957. Paper.
- Tropanakis* (A. G.) La Rhète de Lycurgue: l'Annexe-Tyrtée. ('Ελληνικά, παράρτ. 6.) Pp. 84. Salonika: 'Εταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν 1954. Paper, dr. 25.
- Tuyn* (A.) The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, 43.) Pp. x+415; 24 plates. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957. Paper, \$6.
- Vanhoutte* (M.) La méthode ontologique de Platon. Pp. 193. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1957. Paper, 160 B. fr.
- Walser* (G.) Der Briefwechsel des L. Munatius Plancus mit Cicero. Pp. 207. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1957. Cloth, 10 Sw.fr.
- Walter* (G.) Nero. English translation. Pp. 334. London: Allen & Unwin, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Watson-Wemyss* (A. J.) Select Letters of Cicero. Edited with introduction, notes, index and vocabulary. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xiii+229. London: Macmillan, 1957. Cloth, 6s.
- Weil* (S.) Intimations of Christianity among the Ancient Greeks. Edited and translated by E. C. Geissbuhler. Pp. vii+208. London: Routledge, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Weiss* (R.) Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century. Second edition. (Medium Aevum Monographs, iv.) Pp. xxiii+202. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Whatmough* (J.) Poetic, Scientific and Other Forms of Discourse. (Sather Classical Lectures.) Pp. xi+285. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1957. Cloth, 37s. 6d. net.
- White* (J.) Perspective in Ancient Drawing and Painting. (Journal of Hellenic Studies, Supplementary Paper 7.) Pp. 87; 12 plates. London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 1956. Paper, 16s. net.
- Whiteley* (J. L.) Livy, Book 30. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxii+173. London: Macmillan, 1957. Cloth, 5s. 6d.
- Wiesthaler* (F.) Die Oratio Obliqua als künstlerliches Stilmittel in den Reden Ciceros. (Commentationes Aenipontanae, xii.) Pp. 115. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1956. Paper, ö.S. 120.
- Wilding* (L. A.) Greek for Beginners. Pp. 169. London: Faber, 1957. Cloth, 9s. 6d.
- Wistrand* (E.) Die Chronologie der Punica der Silius Italicus. Beiträge zur Interpretation der flavischen Literatur. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, iv.) Pp. 65. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1957. Paper, Kr. 8.
- Zennari* (J.) I Vercelli dei Celti nella Valle Padana e l'invasione Cimbrica della Venezia. (Annali della Biblioteca Governativa di Cremona, vol. iv, fasc. iii.) Pp. 78. Cremona: Athenaeum Cremonense, 1956. Paper.
- Ziegler* (K.) Plutarchus: Vitae Parallelae. Vol. i, fasc. 1. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xiv+423. Leipzig: Teubner, 1957. Boards, DM. 19.20.
- Zuntz* (G.) Interpretation of a Menander Fragment (Fr. 416 Körte = 481 Kock). Pp. 38. (From Proc. of the Brit. Acad., vol. xlii.) London: Oxford University Press, 1957. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

Abel's *L*
Adcock's
Aeginete
aequus, 1
Ahlvers'
Altheim
edition
edition
America
Andrew
107
Andrew
Tyrant
Ashworth
107
Atlantides

Balsdon
as a M
Barber
Property
Bardon's
Barends'
Bassols d
libro cu

Beare
Plauto,
Beaujeu'
l'empire
Beazley's
Bendz's
Bibliothec
lication

Birley (1
of Nehu
Bishop
Flacco,
Bleiken's
Republ

Bluck (1
selon P
Boak's *M*
Roman

Bolgar
and Re

Bolton (1
104

BOOKS
Borthwick
Bewerte
kureern,

Bradley
Differen
Emenda

Brown (1
Tragic

Brownie
Stellung
Mohrn
tiens,
Apuleius

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

Abel's *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, 175
 Adcock's *Caesar as a Man of Letters*, 127
 Aeginetan War, dating of, 101
aequus, 105
 Ahlvers's *Zahl und Klang bei Platon*, 30
 Altheim's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (2nd edition), 266; his *Römische Geschichte* (2nd edition), 268
 American reprints of out-of-print books, 185
Andrews (M.) Horace, *Sat. i* 6 104-5: 107
 Andrews's *Probouleusis*, 84; his *The Greek Tyrants*, 141
Ashworth (W. D.) Horace, *Sat. i* 6 104-5: 107
Atlantides (Pleiads), 104

Balsdon (J. P. V. D.) on Adcock's *Caesar as a Man of Letters*, 127
Barber (E. A.) on Shackleton Bailey's *Propertiana*, 122
 Bardon's *La littérature latine inconnue* (II), 260
 Barends's *Lexicon Aeneianum*, 78
 Bassols de Climent's *Cornelio Tácito, Historias, libro cuarto*, 168
Beare (W.) on Perna's *L'originalità di Plauto*, 38
 Beaujeu's *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire*, 74
 Beazley's *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*, 49
 Bendz's *Emendationen zu Caelius Aurelianus*, 264
Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis, first year's publication of, 278
Birley (E.) on Hondius-Crone's *The Temple of Nehalennia at Domburg*, 173
Bishop (J. H.) on Ussani's *Studio su Valerio Flacco*, 166
 Bleiken's *Das Volkstribunat der klassischen Republik*, 247
Bluck (R. S.) on Loriaux's *L'être et la forme selon Platon*, 29
 Boak's *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire*, 149
Bolgar (R. R.) on Kristeller's *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*, 156
Bolton (J. D. P.) Notes on Valerius Flaccus, 104
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 89, 185, 279
Borthwick (E. K.) on Neubecker's *Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stoikern und Epikureern*, 215
Bradley (D. R.) on Brugnoli's *Studi sulle Differentiae Verborum*, 175; on Bendz's *Emendationen zu Caelius Aurelianus*, 264
Brown (A. D. F.) The Size of the Greek Tragic Chorus, 1
Browning (R.) on Eiswirth's *Hieronimus' Stellung zur Literatur und Kunst*, 82; on Mohrmann's *Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens, latin médiéval*, 170; on Helm's *Apuleius' Metamorphosen*, 231

Brugnoli's *Studi sulle Differentiae Verborum*, 175
 Brunius-Nilsson's *Δαμώβη*, 76
Brunt (P. A.) Three Passages from Asconius, 193; on Wentker's *Sizilien und Athen*, 243
 Büchner's *Tacitus, Die historischen Versuche*, 168
 Buck's *The Greek Dialects*, 132
 Budé Texts: Athenaeus I-II, 217
 Bühler's *Begriff und Funktion der Dike in den Tragödien des Aischylos*, 158

Campbell (A. Y.) Alcaeus A 6 1: 4
 Capizzi's *Protagora*, 14
 Caprino and others' *La Colonna di Marco Aurelio*, 85
Carson (R. A. G.) on Kraay's *The Aes Coinage of Galba*, 249
 Catiline, alleged first conspiracy of, 193
Chadwick (H.) on Dumortier's *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Les cohabitations suspectes*, 162; on Daniélou's *Grégoire de Nysse, La vie de Moïse*, 163; on Richard's *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, 257; on des Places's *Diadoque de Photice, Œuvres spirituelles*, 258
Chalk (H. H. O.) on Turner's *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe*, 257
Chalmers (W. R.) *Contaminatio*, 12
 Chapman's *Homer*, Allardyce Nicoll's new edition of, 184
 Chorus, size of, in Greek Tragedy, 1 ff.
Clarke (M. L.) on Pease's *Ciceronis De Natura Deorum liber primus*, 235; on Marrou's *History of Education in Antiquity*, 235
 Classical Archaeology, 7th International Congress of, 278
 Classical Association, report on 53rd Annual General Meeting of, 277
 Classical Societies (British), 6th triennial Conference of, 88
 Classical Studies, 3rd International Conference of, 88
 Clausen's *A. Persi Flacci Saturarum liber*, 226
 coins, 51, 248
contaminatio, 12
Cook (R. M.) on Beazley's *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters*, 49; on Richter's *Ancient Italy*, 66; on Polacco's *L'Atleta Cirene-Perinto*, 86; on Andrews's *The Greek Tyrants*, 141; on Ghali-Kahil's *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène*, 159; on Dornseiff's *Kleine Schriften* (I), 266; on Rowe's *Cyrenaican Expedition of the University of Manchester*, 1952, 271; on Karouzou's *The Amasis Painter*, 271; on Warner and Hürli-mann's *Athens and Eternal Greece*, 273
 Copley's *Plautus, The Haunted House*, 80
 Cormack's *Notes on the History of the Inscribed Monuments of Aphrodisias*, 171

- Cowell's *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, 268
Crook (J. A.) on Lewis's *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians*, 72
Cuff (P. J.) on Suolahti's *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army*, 147
curius, 107 f.
- Daniélou's *Grégoire de Nysse, La vie de Moïse*, 163
 Daube's *Forms of Roman Legislation*, 250
Davison (J. A.) on Lobel and Page's *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* and Page's *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 19; reply to Page, 181; on Lord's *Homeric Renaissance*, 254; on Snell, Fleischer, and Mette's *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (II), 254
 Deanesly's *History of Early Medieval Europe*, 269
 Defradas's *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*, 64
 de Keyser's *La signification de l'art dans les Ennéades de Plotin*, 161
 del Grande's *Filologia Minore*, 238
 de Lorenzi's *Fedro*, 125; his *Cronologia ed evoluzione plautina*, 164
de Ste Croix (G. E. M.) on Westermann's *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 54
 de Schaetzen's *Index des terminaisons des marques de potiers gallo-romains sur terra sigillata*, 270
 des Places's *Diadoque de Photicé, Œuvres spirituelles*, 258
 Desrousseaux's *Athénée, Les Deipnosophistes, livres I et II*, 217
Dictionary of Medieval Latin, publication of first fascicule of, 278
 Dihle's *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*, 118
Dioniso summarized (XIX 1-2), 274
Dixon (H. J.) Thucydides ii 4: 198
 Dornseiff's *Kleine Schriften* (I), 266
Dover (K. J.) on Hemmerdinger's *Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide*, 23
 Duchemin's *Pindare, poète et prophète*, 109
 Dumortier's *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Les co-habitations suspectes*, 162
- Edmonds's *Some Greek Poems of Love and Nature*, 36
 Efrydiau *Athronyddol* (XX), publication of, 279
Eichholz (D. E.) on Thomsen's *Textes grecs inédits relatifs aux plantes*, 78; on Desrousseaux's *Athénée, Les Deipnosophistes, livres I et II*, 217
 Eiswirth's *Hieronymus' Stellung zur Literatur und Kunst*, 82
 ephēbi, registration of, at Athens, 195
Eranos summarized (LIV), 274
Eunomia, publication of, 278
Euphrosyne, first publication of, 278
- Faller's *Sancti Ambrosii Opera* (VII), 44
 Fernández-Galiano's *Pindaro, Olimpicas*, 201
 Festugière's *Epicurus and his Gods*, 77
 Feyerabend's *Langenscheidt's Greek-English Dictionary*, 176
 Finley's (J. H.) *Pindar and Aeschylus*, 18
 Finley's (M. I.) *The World of Odysseus*, 199
- Fordyce (C. J.)** on Forster and Heffner's *Columella (II-III) and Josephson's Columellae libri VIII-IX and Die Columella-Handschriften*, 130; on Gregory's *The Poems of Catullus*, 259; on Bardon's *La littérature latine inconnue* (II), 260
 Forster and Heffner's *Columella (II-III)*, 130
 Franko's *Alt-Epirus* 59
Fraser (P. M.) on Hondius-Woodhead's *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (XI, XII, XIII), 136
- Gabriel's *Livia's Garden Room*, 151
 Gentili's *Auximum*, 174
 Ghali-Kahil's *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène*, 159
 Gigon's *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien*, 213
Giles (A. F.) A Joke about Conscriptio, 198
 Giomini's *Saggio sulla 'Fedra' di Seneca*, 167
 Godel's *Platon à Héliopolis d'Égypte*, 256
 Grant's *Tacitus on Imperial Rome*, 228
Greece and Rome, silver jubilee of, 88
 Green's *Augustini Contra Academicos, De Beata Vita, De Ordine*, 263
Greenslade (S. L.) on Faller's *Sancti Ambrosii Opera* (VII), 44; on Hohensee's *The Augustinian Concept of Authority*, 81; on Kramer's *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen*, 81; on Lorie's *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii*, 83; on Simonetti's *Studi Agiograf.*, 83; on Vermeulen's *The Semantic Development of Gloria in early Christian Latin*, 261; on Wolfson's *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (I), 262; on Green's *Augustini Contra Academicos, De Beata Vita, De Ordine*, 263
Gregor (D. B.) ὁ φιλάτωρ, 14
 Gregory's *The Poems of Catullus*, 259
Griffith (J. G.) on de Lorenzi's *Cronologia ed evoluzione plautina*, 164
Guthrie (W. K. C.) on Festugière's *Epicurus and his Gods*, 77; on Herington's *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias*, 84
- Hackforth (R.)** Plato, *Timaeus* 35 a 4-6: 197
 Hackforth's *Plato's Phaedo*, 26
 Haight's *Pseudo-Callisthenes, The Life of Alexander*, 77
Hammond (N. G. L.) Τὸ Μηδικόν and Τὰ Μηδικά, 100
Handford (S. A.) on Barends's *Lexicon Aeneium*, 78
 Handford's *Langenscheidt's Latin-English Dictionary*, 176
 Harmand's *Libanius, Discours sur les Patronages*, 35
Harrison (A. R. W.) on Will's *Korinthiaka*, 61; on Lauffer's *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion* (I), 241
 Helm's *Apuleius' Metamorphosen*, 231
 Hemmerdinger's *Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide*, 23
 Herington's *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias*, 84
Higham (T. F.) Nature Note, 16; on Edmonds's *Some Greek Poems of Love and Nature*, 36; on Wilkinson's *Ovid Recalled*, 40

- Historia*, Etruscan number (VI 1) of, 184
 Hohensee's *The Augustinian Concept of Authority*, 81
 Hondius-Crone's *The Temple of Nehalennia at Domburg*, 173
 Hondius-Woodhead's *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (XI 2, XII, XIII), 136
Hopper (R. J.) on Seftman's *Greek Coins*, 51;
 on Deiradas's *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*, 64; on Andrewes's *Probouleusis*, 84; on von Fritz's *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*, 143; on Momigliano's *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, 154; on Pohlenz's *Griechische Freiheit*, 266; on Lewis and Reinhold's *Roman Civilization* (II), 267
 Hubert-Pohlenz's *Plutarci Moralia* (V 3), 33
Hudson-Williams (H. L.) on Brunius Nilsson's *Δαμόνις*, 76; on Thesleff's *Studies on the Greek Superlative*, 135
 insomnia, 165
 Janssens's *Agamemnon*, 159
Jones (A. H. M.) on Harmand's *Libanius, Discours sur les Patronages*, 35; on Petit's *Libanius et la vie municipale d'Antioche*, 252; on van Berchem's *Le Martyre de la Légion Thébaine*, 264
Jones (D. M.) on Lejeune's *Traité de Phonétique grecque*, 234; on Kalogeras's *Συμβολή στη διαβάθμιση του επιθέτου της αρχαίας 'Ελληνικής*, 174; on Buck's *The Greek Dialects*, 132
Jones (D. Mervyn) on Lever's *The Art of Greek Comedy*, 204
 Josephson's *Columellae libri VIII-IX and Die Columella-Handschriften*, 130
 Kalogeras's *Συμβολή στη διαβάθμιση του επιθέτου της αρχαίας 'Ελληνικής*, 174
 Karouzou's *The Amasis Painter*, 271
Kay (F. L.) Aristarchus' *Τέλος*, 106
Kells (J. H.) on Palm's *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, 160
Kenney (E. J.) Palinode, 16; on Salvatore's *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris*, 124; on Scivoletto's *A. Persi Flacci Saturae and Marmorale's Persio*, 223; on Clausen's *A. Persi Flacci Saturarum liber*, 226; on Prato's *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. A. Seneca*, 260
Ker (A.) on Wistrand's *De Martialis epigr. VIII 15 Commentatiuncula*, 80
Kerferd (G. B.) on Wehrli's *Eudemos von Rhodos*, 32; on Pohlenz's *Die Stoa* (II), 76; on Untersteiner's *Senofane*, 203; on Gigon's *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien*, 213; on Levy's *Plato in Sicily and Godel's Platon à Héliopolis d'Égypte*, 256
Kirk (G. S.) on Capizzi's *Protagora*, 114
 Kitto's *Form and Meaning in Drama*, 207
 Kraay's *The Aes Coinage of Galba*, 248
 Krazylos, first publication of, 88
 Krauer's *Psalmenzitate in Augustins Konfessionen*, 81
 Kristeller's *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*, 156
 Kühn's *System- und Methodenprobleme im Corpus Hippocraticum*, 255
 Kumaniecki's *Andreas Fricii Modrevii Commentarii de republica emendanda*, 87
 Lauffer's *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion* (I), 241
 Lejeune's *Traité de Phonétique grecque*, 234
 Lever's *The Art of Greek Comedy*, 204
 Levy's *Plato in Sicily*, 256
 Lewis and Reinhold's *Roman Civilization* (II), 267
 Lewis's *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians*, 72
 lex Fufia, 198
 Liddell and Scott's *Greek Lexicon*, work on Supplement to 9th edition of, 185
 Linguists, 8th International Conference of, 88
 Lisy-Filologické, publication of supplement to, 278
Lloyd-Jones (P. H. J.) Euripidea, 97; on Webster's *Greek Theatre Production*, 111
 Lobel and Page's *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, 19
 Lodge's *The Philosophy of Plato*, 209
 Loeb Classical Library: Caesar, *Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*, 128; Columella (II-III), 130
 Lord's *Homeric Renaissance*, 254
 Loriaux's *L'être et la forme selon Platon*, 29
 Lorie's *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii*, 83
 Lowes Dickinson's *The Greek Way of Life*, new edition of, 279
Lucas (D. W.) on Janssens's *Agamemnon*, 159; on Kitto's *Form and Meaning in Drama*, 207; on Vellacott's *Aeschylus, The Oresteian Trilogy*, 256
 Lyngby's *Beiträge zur Topographie des Forum-Boarium-Gebietes in Rom*, 172
McAlindon (D.) The Senator's Retiring Age, 108
Macdonald (C.) The Lex Fufia of 59 B.C., 198
MacKay (L. A.) Lucretius V 1009-10: 15
 MacKay's *Janus*, 265
Maguinness (W. S.) on de Lorenzi's *Fedro*, 125; on Giomini's *Saggio sulla 'Fedra' di Seneca*, 167; on Niemirska-Pliszczyńska's *De elocutione Pliniana*, 169
 Marmorale's *Persio*, 223
 Marot's *A görög irodalom kezdetei*, 259
 Marrou's *History of Education in Antiquity*, 235
Martin (R. H.) on Bassols de Climent's *Cornelio Tácito, Historias, libro cuarto*, 168; on Büchner's *Tacitus, Die historische Versuche*, 168
 Martin's *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*, 245
 Mavrogordato's *Digenes Akrites*, 258
 Megillos, Spartan proxenos at Athens, 106 f.
 Meloni's *Il valore storico del libro macedonico di Appiano*, 70
 Mnemosyne summarized (4th S. IX 3-4), 182; (X 1), 275
 Mohrmann's *Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens, latin médiéval*, 170

Momigliano's *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, 154
mules, gelding of, 107 f.

Neubecker's *Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stokern und Epikureern*, 215

Nicholas (J. B. K. M.) on Daube's *Forms of Roman Legislation*, 250

Niemirska-Pliszczyńska's *De elocutione Pliniana*, 169

Novum Testamentum (International Quarterly), first appearance of, 88

octopods, autophagy in, 16 f.
Odyssey, original ending of, 106

Page (B. S.) on de Keyser's *La signification de l'art dans les Ennéades de Plotin*, 161

Page (D. L.) P. Oxy. 2331 and others, 189; reply to Davison, 180

Page's *Sappho and Alcaeus*, 19
Palm's *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*, 160

papyri, 48 f., 189 ff., 219 f.

Parke (H. W.) The Spartan Embassy to Athens (408/7 B.C.), 106

Pasquali's work, publication of bibliography of, 279

Pastorino's *Iuli Firmici Materni De errore profanarum religionum*, 233

Pauly's *Realencyclopädie*, publication of XXIII 1, 184

Pearson (L.) on Haight's *Pseudo-Callisthenes, The Life of Alexander*, 77; on Abel's *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, 175

Pease's *Ciceronis De Natura Deorum liber primus*, 220

Peck's *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* (I), 115

Perna's *L'originalità di Plauto*, 38

Petit's *Libanius et la vie municipale à Antioche*, 252

Plato, five articles on, in Welsh, 279

Plommer (W. H.) on Gabriel's *Livia's Garden Room*, 151; on Will's *Délos* (XXII), 170

Pohlenz's *Die Stoa* (II), 76; his *Griechische Freiheit*, 266

Prato's *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. A. Seneca*, 260

Prete (S.) defends his edition of Terence, 177

Raby (F. J. E.) on Rapisarda's *Consolatio Poesis in Boezio*, 261; on Deanesly's *History of Early Medieval Europe*, 269

Rapisarda's *Consolatio Poesis in Boezio*, 261

Rattenbury (R. M.) on van Groningen's *Short Manual of Greek Palaeography* and Roberts's *Greek Literary Hands*, 45

Rees (B. R.) on Tait and Préaux's *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library* (II), 79
Revue de Philologie summarized (XXX 1), 276; (XXX 2), 183

Reynolds (J. M.) on Caprino and others' *La Colonna di Marco Aurelio*, 85; on Lyngby's *Beiträge zur Topographie des Forum-Boarium-Gebietes in Rom*, 172; on Gentili's *Auximum*, 174

Reynolds (L. D.) Two Notes on the Manuscripts of Seneca's *Letters*, 5

Rheinisches Museum summarized (XCIX 2), 184; (XCIX 3-4, C 1), 276

Richard's *Asterii Sophistae Commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, 257

Richter's *Ancient Italy*, 66; her *Catalogue of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*, 272

Robertson (D. S.) on Duchemin's *Pindare, poète et prophète*, 109; on Snell's *Pindari Carmina* (2nd edition), 159; on Fernández-Galiano's *Pindaro, Olímpicas*, 201

Roberts's *Greek Literary Hands*, 45

Rose (H. J.) on Finley's *Pindar and Aeschylus*, 18; on Pastorino's *Iuli Firmici Materni De errore profanarum religionum*, 233; on Wagenvoort's *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, 239; on MacKay's *Janus*, 265; on Altheim's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (2nd edition), 266

Rowe's *Cyrenaean Expedition of the University of Manchester*, 1952, 271

Runciman (S.) on Weitzmann's *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in honor of A. M. Friend*, 86; von Mavrogordato's *Digenes Akrites*, 258

Ryberg's *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art*, 52

Salvatore's *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris*, 124

Sandbach (F. H.) *Virgil, Aeneid V* 315 ff.: 102; on Hubert-Pohlenz's *Plutarchi Moralia* (V 3), 33

Schachermeyr's *Die ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands*, 139

Scivoletto's *A. Persi Flacci Saturae*, 223

Scullard (H. H.) on Smith's *The Failure of the Roman Republic*, 68; on Thiel's *History of Roman Sea-Power and Wallinga's The Boarding-bridge of the Romans*, 144; on Bleiken's *Das Volkstribunat der klassischen Republik*, 247; on Cowell's *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, 268

Sealey (B. R. I.) On Coming of Age in Athens, 195

Seltman's *Greek Coins*, 51

senators, retiring age of, 108

Seneca's *Letters*, manuscripts of, 5 ff.

Shackleton Bailey's *Propertiana*, 122

Siegmann's *Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, 219
signare, 102 f.

Simonetti's *Studi Agiografi*, 83

Skutsch (O.) replies to Prete's letter, 177

Smith's *The Failure of the Roman Republic*, 68
Snell, Fleischer, and Mette's *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (II), 254

Snell's *Pindari Carmina* (2nd edition), 159

Stanford (W. B.) on Finley's *The World of Odysseus*, 199

Staveley (E. S.) on Altheim's *Römische Geschichte* (2nd edition), 268

Stevens (P. T.) on del Grande's *Filologia Minore*, 238

Straus's *Terenz und Menander*, 120

Stubbings (F. H.) on Schachermeyr's *Die ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands*, 139

Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica (XXVII-XXVIII), 1956, publication of, 279

- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 181,
274
Suolahti's *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army*, 147
- Tait and Præaux's *Greek Ostraca in the Bodleian Library* (II), 79
- Tate (J.) on Hackforth's *Plato's Phædo*, 26; on Taylor's *Plato, Philebus and Epinomis*, 211; on Kühn's *System- und Methodenprobleme im Corpus Hippocraticum*, 255; on Marôt's *A görög irodalom kezdetei*, 259
- Taylor's *Plato, Philebus and Epinomis*, 211
- Teubner Texts: Pindar (2nd edition), 159; Plutarch's *Moralia* (V 3), 33
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, reprint of *Index librorum, scriptorum, inscriptionum* of, 87
- Thesleff's *Studies on the Greek Superlative*, 135
- Thiel's *History of Roman Sea-Power*, 144
- Thomson's *Textes inédits relatifs aux plantes*, 78
- Tjäder's *Die nichtliterarischen Papyri Italiens*, 48
- Toynbee and Ward Perkins's *The Shrine of Saint Peter*, 152
- Toynbee (J. M. C.) on Ryberg's *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art*, 52; on Richter's *Ancient Italy*, 66; on Beaujeu's *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire*, 74; on Richter's *Catalogue of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*, 272
- Transactions of the American Philological Association* summarized (LXXXVI), 181
- Trevaskis (J. R.) on Ahlvers's *Zahl und Klang bei Platon*, 30; on Lodge's *The Philosophy of Plato*, 209
- Trypanis (C. A.) [Moschus] III 37: 107
- Turner (E. G.) on Tjäder's *Die nichtliterarischen Papyri Italiens*, 48; on Siegmann's *Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, 219
- Turner's *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe*, 257
- Ullman's *Colucii Salutati De laboribus Herculis*, 87
- Untersteiner's *Senofane*, 203
- Ussani's *Insomnia*, 165; his *Studio su Valerio Flacco*, 166
- van Berchem's *Le Martyre de la Légion Thébaine*, 264
- van der Linden's *Een speciaal gebruik van de ablativus absolutus bij Caesar*, 166
- van Groningen's *Short Manual of Greek Palaeography*, 45
- vase-painting, 49, 271
- Vellacott's *Aeschylus, The Oresteian Trilogy*, 256
- Vermeulen's *The Semantic Development of Gloria in early-Christian Latin*, 261
- von Fritz's *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*, 143
- Wagenvoort's *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, 239
- Walbank (F. W.) on Franke's *All-Epirus*, 59; on Meloni's *Il valore storico del libro macedonico di Appiano*, 70
- Wallinga's *The Boarding-bridge of the Romans*, 144
- Warmington (B. H.) on Boak's *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire*, 149
- Warner and Hürlimann's *Athens and Eternal Greece*, 273
- Way's *Caesar, Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*, 128
- Webster's *Greek Theatre Production*, 111
- Wehrli's *Eudemos von Rhodos*, 32
- Weitzmann's *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in honor of A. M. Friend*, 86
- Wentker's *Sizilien und Athen*, 243
- Westermann's *The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 54
- Westlake (E. D.) on Dible's *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*, 118
- Whittick (G. C.) on Way's *Caesar, Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*, 128; on van der Linden's *Een speciaal gebruik van de ablativus absolutus bij Caesar*, 166; on Feyerabend's *Langenscheidt's Greek-English Dictionary and Handford's Langenscheidt's Latin-English Dictionary*, 176
- Wilkinson's *Ovid Recalled*, 40
- Williams (G. W.) on Copley's *Plautus, The Haunted House*, 80; on Straus's *Terenz und Menander*, 120
- Williams (R. D.) on Ussani's *Insomnia*, 165
- Will's (Édouard) *Korinthiaka*, 61
- Will's (Ernest) *Délos* (XXII), 170
- Winnington-Ingram (R. P.) on Bühler's *Begriff und Funktion der Dike in den Tragödien des Aischylos*, 158
- Wistrand's *De Martialis epiqr. VIII 15 Commentatiuncula*, 80
- Wolfson's *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (I), 262
- Woodcock (E. C.) on Grant's *Tacitus on Imperial Rome*, 228
- Woodhead (A. G.) on Peek's *Griechische Vers-Inscripfen* (I), 115; on Toynbee and Ward Perkins's *The Shrine of St. Peter*, 152; on Cormack's *Notes on the History of the Inscribed Monuments of Aphrodisias*, 171
- Wright (R. P.) on de Schaezen's *Index des terminaisons des marques de potiers gallo-romains sur terra sigillata*, 270
- Wycherley (R. E.) on Martin's *L'Urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*, 245
- Young (D. C. C.) on Kumaniecki's *Andreae Fricii Modrevii Commentarii de republica emendanda*, 87; on Ullman's *Colucii Salutati De laboribus Herculis*, 87

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note.—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

Aeschylus *A.* 1348 ff.: 1. *Ch.* 235: 15. *Eu.* 711–30: 3. *PV* 405, 414: 191. *Sept.* 1042: 98. *Supp.* 321: 2; 602: 15; 928: 3; 1021: 191

Alcaeus *A* 6 1, *Z* 2: 4
Alciphron *iii* 38: 190
Anth. Pal. ix 441: 190
Anth. Plan. iv 102: 190
Antimachus *fr.* 16 5 (Kinkel): 4
Apollodorus *ii* 4 8: 190
Apollonius Rhodius *i* 528, 912, *iv* 451: 4
Aratus *Phaen.* 256: 104
Aristophanes *Av.* 187: 98. *Pax* 305: 192
Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 23 5: 101; 42 1–2: 197; 56 2–3: 195
Asconius *p.* 81 (Clark): 198; *p.* 83 2: 195; *p.* 83 14 ff.: 193; *p.* 83 21: 195; pp. 85, 87, 89: 198; *p.* 92 11 ff.: 193; *p.* 93 10 ff. and *passim*: 194

BGU 611: 108

Cicero *Arch.* 17: 190. *Att.* ii 6 2: 193; *xiii* 25 3: 16; *xiv* 17 6: 193. *de Sen.* 47: 190. *Fam.* ix 8 1: 16

Demosthenes *xxvii* *passim*, *xxix* 34, 59: 196; *xxx* 15: 195; *xxxi* 14: 196
[Demosthenes] *xliv* 39: 195
Dio *xxxviii* 8 1: 198; *xxxix* 10: 193; *lx* 11 6–8, 12 1–5, 25 6, 29 2: 108
Diodorus Siculus *iv* 9 2: 190

Euripides *Alc.* 1133, *Andr.* 64, *Bacch.* 178: 15.
El. 229, 345, 767: 14; 576: 15; 1058–9: 99.
Hec. 505: 14; 990, 1114: 15. *Hel.* 625, 636, *Herac.* 640, 788, *HF* 490, 531, *Hipp.* 1452: 14. *Ion* 237–8: 97; 1018, 1437, 1488: 15.
IA 1452: 14. *IT* 795, 815, 827: 15; 1056: 14. *Med.* 1127–8: 15. *Or.* 217, 1045, 1100: 14; 1097: 99; 1621–4: 97. *Phoen.* 568–83: 98; 1072: 15; 1680: 97. *Supp.* 332, 641: 14. *fr.* 263 *N.*: 99

Fr. Gr. Hist. 324 f 44: 106

Herodotus *iv* 5, 9: 104; *vi* 89–92: 101; *vii* 158 4, 168 4: 100; *ix* 98 f., 104: 101

Hesiod *Op.* 524–6: 16

Homer *Il.* *xxiii* 373–6: 103. *Od.* v 432 f.: 17; *xxiii* 295–9: 106

Horace *A. P.* 159: 103. *S.* i 6 104–5: 107

Isaeus *vii* 28: 195

Lucan v 4: 104

Lucretius v 1009–10: 15 f.

Lycophron *Alex.* 33: 190

Lysias *xxi*: 195

Menander *Perinthia* 397–8 *K.*: 13
[Moschus] *iii* 37: 107

Nonnus *Dion.* *vii* 126: 190

Ovid *Am.* ii 2 23–24: 16; ii 11 15: 102. *M.* *viii* 1 ff.: 107; x 672: 103. *Tr.* ii 127: 98

PHibeh II 173: 192

POxy. 2162 *fr.* 1 (a): 191; 2256 *fr.* 9 (a) 16:

192; 2331: 189; 2359: 192

Parthenius *fr.* 20 (Martini): 107

Philodemus *Rhet.* ii 297 *S.*: 190

Plato *Lg.* 642 b: 106. *Smp.* 174 d: 198. *Ti.* 35 a 4–6: 197

Plautus *Cist.* 693 ff.: 102

Pliny *Ep.* ix 33: 17

Pliny *NH* *xxxv* 114: 190

Plutarch *Crass.* 13 3: 193

Pollux *iv* 110: 1; *vii* 117: 192

Proclus *in Tim.* ii 155–6 (Diehl): 197

Propertius *iv* 1 20: 108

Rutilius Namatianus ii 54: 107

Sallust *C.* 19: 195

S.H.A. *Hadr.* 12 4: 198. *M. Ant.* 11 7: 199

Seneca *Brev. Vit.* 20: 108. *Ep.* 120: 5 ff.

Seneca *Controv.* i 8 4: 108

Silius *iv* 147, *xvi* 485, 488 ff.: 103

Sophocles *Aj.* 996, *Ant.* 572: 14; 663: 98.

El. 663–4: 97; 871: 14; 1224: 15; 1227:

14; 1354: 15; 1398, *OC* 465, 607, 891,

1169, 1415, 1552: 14. *OT* 583: 100. *Phil.*

1020: 99. *Trach.* 114–15: 5; 187, 232: 15.

fr. 534 6, 878 *P.*: 191

Statius *Theb.* *iv* 257: 103; *vi* 118 f.: 105; *vi* 904: 103

Suetonius *Claud.* 23–24: 108. *Iul.* 9: 195

Tacitus *A.* xi 6–7, 25 5–6, *xii* 52 4: 108

Terence *Ad.* 6–14: 14; 15–21: 12. *And.* 18–

21: 14; 229–32, 368–9: 13. *Eun.* 30–33:

14; 91 f.: 105. *Heaut.* 20–21: 14; 22–26: 12

Theocritus *xiii* 25 ff.: 104; *xxii* 9: 98

Thucydides *i* *passim*: 100 f.; ii 4 4, 18: 198;

ii 7 1, *iii* 10 2: 101; *iii* 89: 5; *vi* 59 4:

100 f.; *viii* 53 2: 98; *viii* 65: 198

Valerius Flaccus *ii* 72: 104; v 551: 105; *vi*

52, 57 ff.: 104; *vi* 427 ff., 661, *vii* 159–60:

105; *vii* 176, *viii* 350, and *passim*: 106

Virgil *A.* ii 423, v 315 ff.: 102; *vii* 793–4,

808: 103; *xii* 3: 102; *xii* 162–4: 104. *G.* i

221, ii 154: 104; *iii* 118: 105

[Virgil] *Ciris* 514 ff.: 107

Xenophon *Hell.* *iii* 4 6: 106; v 4 63–66: 197

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀγροίκος, 190
αἰάζομαι, 191
ἀμόγως, 190
ἀνόστεος, 17
ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν, 192
ἀστομος, 190
βιάζομαι, 97 f.
γε, 99 f.
γρύλλος, 190

ἐγώ, 191
ἐν μέσῳ πεσεῖν, 98 f.
ἐνσχερώ, 4
ἐπισχέω, 4
ἔργον 'action', 101
ἡδύ (= ἡδονή), 99
κάρναλις, 190
καταδιαβαίνω, 191
καταλαμβάνω, 198

κείρις, 107
πολύπους, 17
προσπνίζας, 191
σηπία, 17
σχερός, 4
τὰ Μηδικά, τὸ Μηδικόν, 100 f.
τρισέληνος, 190
φίλτατος, 14



The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

NEW VOLUMES, 1957-8

LATIN

309 CICERO. *Pro Sestio*, In Vatinius.

447 CICERO. *Pro Caelio*, *De Provinciis Consularibus*, *Pro Balbo*.

Translated by the late J. H. Freese, St. John's College, Cambridge, and R. Gardner, Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

GREEK

421 CALLIMACHUS. *Fragments*. Translated and annotated by C. A. Trypanis, Exeter College, Oxford.

409 DIODORUS SICULUS. 12 volumes, vol. XI. *Fragments of Books XXI-XXXII*. Translated by Francis R. Walton, State University of Florida.

406 PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. 15 volumes, vol. XII. Translated by H. Cherniss and W. C. Helmbold.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

NOVUM GLOSSARIUM MEDIAE LATINITATIS

ab anno DCCC usque ad annum MCC
edendum curavit Consilium Acad.
Consociatarum

Sponsored by the Union Académique Internationale, this entirely new Dictionary of Medieval Latin, the result of some thirty-five years' work, has begun to appear. The fascicule containing the letter 'L', in 232 columns, is now ready, and the 'Index Scriptorum', 194 pp., at the subscription price of £2. 2s. 6d. and £4. 5s. respectively. Altogether the work will, it is estimated, take about 4,640 quarto pages. The rate of publication cannot for editorial reasons be accurately forecast, but it is intended to publish one or two fascicules yearly, the next being 'M' and 'N' (in 1958). Definitions are in French.

British Distributors

W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd., Petty Cury, Cambridge

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT IN BYZANTIUM

From Justinian I to the last Palaeologus

Passages from Byzantine Writers and Documents

Translated with Introduction and Notes by SIR ERNEST BARKER

These translations are preceded by introductory chapters on the Byzantine literary tradition and system of society and government, and the book in a sense forms a pendant to Sir Ernest Barker's earlier work *From Alexander to Constantine*, which dealt with the Greco-Roman world of antiquity from 336 B.C. to A.D. 337.
30s. net

THE INDO-GREEKS

A. K. NARAIN

This book tells the story of the rise and fall of an adventurous people. The Indo-Greeks are shown for the first time against two backgrounds—the world of the heirs of Alexander in Western Asia, and that of the successors of the Mauryas in India.

Illustrated 42s. net

HORACE

EDUARD FRAENKEL

Presenting interpretations of most of Horace's writings, this book attempts to outline the history of his work and help the reader to understand and appreciate it as a whole.

55s. net

Oxford Classical Texts

ARISTOTELIS POLITICA

Edited by SIR DAVID ROSS

25s. net

ARISTOTELIS METAPHYSICA

Edited by WERNER JAEGER

25s. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Short Reviews	254
Summaries of Periodicals	274
Notes and News	277
Books Received	279
Index	284

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

Greece and Isles of Greece Cruises

Reservations, tickets, etc., from representatives ASSOCIATION OF STEAMSHIP OWNERS OF GREECE maintaining services in the Mediterranean and isles of Greece and coastal ports

*Teachers and students 20% to
30% rebate*

MEMBERS:

HELLENIC MEDITERRANEAN LINES
TYPALDOS LINES · EPIROTIKY LINE
KAVOUNIDES LINE · FOUSTANOUS LINE
SIGALAS LINE · NOMIKOS LINES · JOHN
TOYAS LINES · NEW EPIROTIKY LINE
EVAN TOYAS LINE · DIAPOULIS LINE
LATSIS LINE

Handbook to Greece— Turkey, Cyprus and Malta with Hellenic self-taught section

36 illustrations, plans and map, 12s. 6d.
plus postage 1s. 10d.

The ideal companion-guide for intending
travellers. Most reasonably priced for
the wealth of information it contains
when compared to others.

Book through your travel agent or

OCEANWAYS STEAMSHIP AGENCY LTD.

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus, London, S.W. 1

Phones: TRAfalgar 6055-56

Cables: Dakoglu

6710